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**HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ADJECTIVE ACCENTUATION IN CROATIAN (SUFFIXLESS, *-ьнъ AND *-ьkъ ADJECTIVES)**

**Introduction**

The article deals with the historical development of the accentuation of suffixless (root), *-ьнъ and *-ьkъ adjectives. Their development is analyzed in detail from their Proto-Slavic origin to their modern reflexes in Štokavian, Čakavian and Kajkavian dialects. The dialectal data is taken from previously published dialectal descriptions, but also from the author’s own extensive and previously unpublished field data – mostly from Posavina and Vrgorska krajina. As we shall see, the analysis of the historical development of adjectival accentuation can provide us with interesting insights that go beyond the scope of adjectives. A careful historical study of adjectival accentuation reveals many interesting early changes and isoglosses in Štok/Čak/Kajk., helps us understand the modern dialectal forms, which are then

---

1 The name *Croatian* is used because the article deals mostly with data from dialects spoken in Croatia. Of course, it goes without saying that the analysis of the developments in Štokavian is valid not only for the dialects of Štokavian spoken in Croatia or by ethnic Croats but also for those spoken in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and Montenegro.

2 I would like to thank Tijmen Pronk, Dijana Ćurković and especially Mikhail Oslon for proofreading of the article. I also owe my gratitude to Misha Oslon for letting me use his Juraj Križanić database (material from Križanić’s texts that does not have an explicit reference stems from this database) and for helping me with it.

3 The separate treatment of Štokavian, Čakavian and Kajkavian should be regarded as provisory. The whole South Slavic territory is a prototypical example of a dialect continuum (cf. Vermeer 1982; Kapović 2011d, 150–152).

4 The field material from Posavina often provides insights that cannot be found in the classical work of Ivšić’s (1913), where the information needed for this kind of studies is usually insufficient and sometimes even misleading.
far more useful from a comparative Slavic perspective and shed light on some important prosodic changes that occurred in the history of Štok/Čak/Kajk., such as the ‘One mora law’ (cf. Kapović 2011b). The rest of the topics related to adjectives (i.e. adjectives with other suffixes, comparative and adverbs) will be analyzed in future works.

Unlike nouns, where the accentual paradigm, if it changes at all, changes mostly in individual words as a result of which the descriptions of the history of noun accentuation deal mostly with paradigmatic accentuation,\(^5\) when dealing with adjectives the accentual paradigm is often changed in a whole class of adjectives or large groups of adjectives at once. That is why it is possible for all (or most) of the adjectives with a certain suffix and a specific number of syllables to shift entirely to another accentual paradigm, e.g. for -an adjectives to shift from a.p. A to a.p. C.\(^6\) Thus, the history of adjectival accentuation deals more with such interparadigmatic shifts than with intraparadigmatic changes, unlike the history of noun accentuation that deals mostly with intraparadigmatic changes (i.e. the changes of the accent in various cases in different accentual paradigms). This is also due to the fact that indefinite adjectives in Slavic mostly have the same declension as nouns, while the accentuation of the definite forms is constant in all cases, i.e. identical to the accentuation of the nominative. Of course, such paradigmatic shifts need not be marked in lists of adjectives.\(^7\) Another specific trait of adjective accentuation is the importance of analyzing all or most of the available examples. That is the only way to interpret the

\(^{5}\) Cf. for instance Kapović 2010.

\(^{6}\) We use a, b, c for Proto-Slavic accentual paradigms (a.p.) and A, B, C for modern, synchronic accentual paradigms. The semicolon (:) is used to mark the long variant of the synchronic accentual paradigms (like a.p. B: or C:). Other abbreviations include: sg. (singular), pl. (plural); nom. (nominative), gen. (genitive), dat. (dative), acc. (accusative), voc. (vocative), loc. (locative), instr. (instrumental) (also N/G/D/A/V/L/I. and n/g/d/a/v/l/i. for sg. and pl. respectively in paradigms); m. (masculine), f. (feminine), n. (neuter); adj. (adjective); def. (definite), indef. (indefinite); dial. (dialect), Stand. (Standard); ct. (century); Čroat. (Croatian), Štok. (Štokavian), Čak. (Čakavian), Kajk. (Kajkavian), Lith. (Lithuanian), Slv. (Slovene), OCS (Old Church Slavic), PSl. (Proto-Slavic), BSI (Balto-Slavic). The mark + is used for (dialectal) forms that are not directly attested in a given source but can be supposed as such according to the rules given in the description.

\(^{7}\) If these were marked, almost all adjectives would be A/B/C, which would make the list practically useless.
development of the accentual pattern of a certain class of adjectives, since it is very common for the original pattern to be preserved in just one or a couple of words (for instance in gol ‘naked’, bos ‘barefoot’, bolan ‘painful’, tanak ‘thin’, gorak ‘bitter’, dobar ‘good’). Thus, it is useless just to analyze the accentual paradigms in general without paying attention to what happened to the adjectives that belonged to certain accentual patterns.

In some cases, it is very difficult to establish a ‘common’ or ‘original’ accentual paradigm (even if the Proto-Slavic reconstruction is certain) so the grouping in the lists of adjectives should be regarded as provisional. Some of the changes are described in more than one place in the article – for instance, if there is an a.p. $a >$ a.p. C shift, this can be analyzed both in the a.p. $a$ or a.p. $c$ section of the text. The text should be read as a whole since many parts are not repeated or are not repeated in detail – for instance, if some feature is analyzed in Štokavian, the same or a similar feature will not be analyzed in Čakavian or it will be analyzed in less detail; or – if the same process occurs in different adjectival groups (e.g. both in root and *-ьнъ adjectives), it will be dealt with when describing the accentuation of the first group and just be mentioned briefly elsewhere.

The suffixless adjectives
1. a.p. $a$

Proto-Slavic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*čístь ‘clean’</td>
<td>*čísta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The a.p. $a$ root (suffixless) adjectives had a constant acute on the stem in Proto-Slavic, either on the first (*čístь) or on any other syllable (*bogäťь). The short syllable equivalent was the short neo-acute (*gotòvъ). The stress remains in the same position in definite adjectives.

Cf. in Russian:

рад – рàда – рàдо

In some adjectives in Russian, the root stress is preserved (a.p. A). But monosyllabic adjectives usually shift to a.p. C in short forms,\(^8\) cf. числ –

чисто (but both чисты and чисты in the plural). The original stress position is preserved in def. forms: чистый – чистая – чистое.

**Štokavian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m f n</td>
<td>m f n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čist čista (čista) čisto (čisto)</td>
<td>čistī čistī (čistā) čistō (čistō)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original a.p. a adjectives have a constant " on the stem in the classical (Daničić-Vuk) literary Štokavian, i.e. their reflex is a.p. A. This is also the situation in many Štokavian dialects. However, the same kind of fixed root stress, i.e. the synchronic a.p. A, is seen in original short vowel a.p. b adjectives such as növ ‘new’, the one exception being the adjective gõl ‘naked’, which remains in a.p. B. Here, we can see a tendency of adjectives splitting into two classes based on the quantity of the root (something similar exists in *-ьнъ adjectives as well, see below). Thus, we have adjectives with a short root vowel (whether they are ultimately derived from the original a.p. a acute or from the original a.p. b short neo-acute) in a.p. A (except for gol and bos), while adjectives with a long root vowel belong to a.p. B: or a.p. C: (the B: vs. C: opposition is lost in many dialects). Thus in the East, a number of Štokavian dialects show a shift a.p. C: > B:, while a number of Western dialects, mostly Čakavian, have the opposite change in most adjectives – a.p. B: > C:. In classical literary Štokavian, one finds the system with all short vowel monosyllabic suffixless adjectives in a.p. A and all long vowel monosyllabic suffixless adjectives in a.p. B:, thus sît – sîta – sîto ‘satiated’ / nòv – növa – nòvo ‘new’ : žût – žûta – žûto ‘yellow’ / drâg – drâga – drâgo ‘dear’. The merger of the original

---

9 Cf. for instance Даничић 1925, 213.
10 The form gõl in standard Croatian is secondary compared to gô. The length is due to the vocalization of the final -l# (gõl > gõo > gô → gõl).
11 Similarly, the semantically close adjective bôs ‘barefoot’ remains the only monosyllabic short vowel a.p. C adjective in many dialects.
13 This was the case in classical, Vuk-Daničić, ‘Serbo-Croatian’. In the contemporary Croatian norm, the situation is a little different, because the Western Štokavian archaic distinction of a.p. B: and C: (žûto : drâgo) is getting back into the standard norm.
a.p. a and short vowel a.p. b (sit = nòv) encompasses both Štokavian and Čakavian, which is a major accentual innovation. However, this merger is not certain in the case of Kajkavian – the situation there is inconclusive (see below).

In later versions of literary Štokavian, as well as in contemporary Standard Croatian, one finds both the original a.p. A (i.e. a constant “ in all indef. forms) but also the newer a.p. B (čisto / nòvo). This sort of shift is common to many Štokavian dialects. In a.p. A, the short falling accent is constant in all forms, while in a.p. B all cases except nom. (and acc. sg. if the noun is non-animate) have a ’ (i.e. original end stress): nom. sg. čist ‘clean’, gen. sg. čista / čista, dat. sg. čistu / čistu, instr. sg. čistim / čistim, etc.


The above-mentioned a.p. B is, all things considered, secondary in comparison to the older a.p. A, thus čist / nòv A > B. The merger of original a.p. a adjectives like sláb < *slábv and original short vowel a.p. b adjectives like lòš < *lòšь ‘bad’ is not a recent change, considering that a.p. A in adjectives like these appears in Čakavian as well (see below). It seems that the distinction of the original a.p. a and short vowel a.p. b adjectives is not preserved anywhere in Croatian (except, in a very limited way, in a few adverbs and in Križanić’s dialect, see below). Theoretically speaking, a.p. B (čisto = pròsto) in certain dialects could also be explained

---

14 Doublets of that type appear in the standard language since PHKJ (1960). Cf. also for instance Matešić 1970, 164; Stankiewicz 1993, 126, etc.

15 Benić says that the forms stàra instead of the more frequent stàra and sita instead of the much more frequent sita appear sporadically as well, but that such variants are almost non-existent in other examples.

16 Cf. mȁlo ‘few’ (and zàmalo ’almost’), rȁno ‘early’ (and zàrana) from the original a.p. a, but skòro ‘recently; almost’ (the original a.p. b).
as the result of the old merger of a.p. a and short vowel a.p. b adjectives not in a.p. A but in a.p. B. That is to say that in some dialects the merger of original čistogram novonom went in the direction of čistogram nòvovo (A) while in others it went in the direction of čistogram nòvovo (B). However, this option does not seem very likely since the progress of the secondary shift A > B can be clearly observed in some dialects (cf. the Posavian data below).

The mix of the paradigmatic reflexes of the original a.p. a and short vowel a.p. b is most easily explained on the basis of the same form in nom. sg. m. (čȉstə = nȍv), since both the old acute (*čı̂stъ) and the old short neo-circumflex (*nòvъ) yield the same result. By analogy to these forms, the same accent can be generalized in other forms as well. However, it is unusual for an analogy of this kind, i.e. short vowel a.p. b > a.p. A shift, to have occurred so early. In addition, it seems that the root fixation of stress in the old short vowel a.p. b cannot be a result of the equation čȉst = nȍv, considering the fact that the merger was already present in Križanić’s language, where the reflexes of the old acute and the short neo-acute had not yet merged completely (see below).


Šimundić (1971, 126–127), as usual, has alternative forms – both a.p. A and C’ for most adjectives such as čȉst and nȍv but also a.p. B for pȕn and a.p. A or B for ĭj ‘quiet’ (and lȁk ‘light’, which is originally an *-ȕkь adjective).


17 A.p. C’ means that there is no lengthening in nom. sg. m. (as in bȕś), which is a characteristic of the original a.p. C.
strem ‘steep’, škrt ‘stingy’ (gen. sg. m. škřta) – f. škrt (gen. sg. f. škrtě, acc. sg. f. škrtu), zdrav ‘healthy’, as well as in: lоś – lоša – lоšо, lάк, nоv, prоst ‘rude’, spоr ‘slow’. The exceptions are tij – tija – tijo ‘quiet’ (due to the disappearance of -h-, the lengthening in front of -j# and analogy in other forms) and the adjectives pùn, vrija ‘boiling’ and zrija ‘ripe’ that shift to a.p. B: pùn (gen. sg. m. pùna) – f. pùna (gen. sg. f. pùnе) – n. pùno (also a frequent adverb pùno) – pl. pùni.


The shift to a.p. C’ is seen in Dubrovnik as well, which is thus in concordance with the Dalmatian Neo-Štokavian dialects to the north of it. Cf. Dubrovnik nȍv – nòva – nȍvo, as well as čȉst, dug, plah ‘timid’, tih (Budmani 1883, 172).

In Molise Croatian (Piccoli, Sammartino 2000), an emigrant Štokavian dialect in Italy (with its origins in the hinterland of the town of Makarska and near the river Cetina, which is dialectologically close to the dialects just mentioned), one finds the following – preserved a.p. A in a group of adjectives: čȉst, -a, -o (the same pattern in nȍv, sȉt, stȁr, zdrȁv), while the other group shifts to a.p. C’: dȕg – dúga19 – dúgo (the same pattern in mȅk ‘soft’, pùn, zrijȃ, žȕk ‘bitter’).20 This clearly represents the older phase of a.p. A > C’ shift in this area. At the time of their departure, the shift had obviously already taken place, but it was clearly still a change in progress – the process was not complete, as is the case in the dialects of the area today.

In the Old Štokavian Slavonian dialect, the situation is different. As we have already seen, the original a.p. A is preserved in Šaptinovac. Ivšić

---

18 Cf. bȕs – bȕsa – bȕso in Imotska (Ši m u n d i č 1971, 131) and Vrgorska Krajina (my data).
19 From the older *dugȁ, since the dialect has kanovačko lengthening (i.e. ’ instead of ‘).
20 The form zrijȃ seems to be a regular reflex of the older *zrȋl (cf. also variants gȍl and gȍjȃ and cȉjȃ from *cȋl ‘whole’) even though the development is not quite clear. The adjectives mȅk and žȕk are not *-ьkъ adjectives originally (see below).

That Ivšić’s claims of a general a.p. C’ pattern in Posavina in these kinds of adjectives are wrong, is confirmed not only by the already mentioned later studies but also by my own field material from Posavina. Here, we shall present the data from seven Posavian villages – in all of them, the original a.p. A is preserved in many adjectives and in some of the dialects in most of them. The most archaic dialects are those of Budrovci, Brodski Stupnik, (Slavonski) Koba and Sikerevci. In Budrovci, only spȏr (spòra – spȏro) shifts to a.p. C, with a.p. A perfectly preserved in all other adjectives, cf. slȁb – slȁba – slȁbo – def. slȁbō (thus also čil – čȉla, čist, trȏm – trȏma, lōš, mȅk, nȏv – nȍva, prȃv, prȍst, pȕn – pȉna, sȉ, smȅd, stȁr – stȁra, stȏm – strȏma, strȏg, Ŵh, trȗl – trȗla, vjȅšt, vrȅl – vrȅla, zdrȃv – zdrȁva, zrȅl – zrȅla).

In Brodski Stupnik, only čist shifts to a.p. B (čista – čìsto), while all other adjectives (čil, lōš, mȅk, nȏv, prȃv, prȍst, pȕn, rȉda ‘red haired’, sȉ, slȁb, smȅd, spȏr, stȁr, stȏm, strȏg, Ŵh, trȗm, trȗl ‘rotten’, vrȅl, zdrȃv, zrȅl) preserve the original a.p. A. In Kobaš, most adjectives preserve the original a.p. A (mȉl, nȏv, prȍst (def. C), pȉn, sȉ, slȁb, smȅd, spȏr, stȁr, strȏg, Ŵh, zdrȁv), while only two adjectives (čist and tȃšt ‘vain’) shift to a.p. C’. In Sikerevci, almost all adjectives remain in a.p. A (thus prȏst, pȉn, rȉd, rȏm ‘lame’, slȁb, smȅd, sȉ, stȁr (and C), strȏg, Ŵh, trȗl, zdrȁv, zrȅl), while čist and spȏr shift to a.p. C/C’ (the adj. škȓt has a.p. C: pattern). In Babina Greda, a.p. A is preserved by pȗn (also C’), rȁd ‘glad’, rȉd, slȁb, spȏr (also C), stȁr, strȏg, Ŵh, zdrȁv, while nȏv shifts to the mixed a.p. A-B and čist, prȍst, sȉt

---

21 Ivšić notes the monosyllabic adjectival a.p. B only in lakȁ – lakȍ ‘easy’ but this is, as already mentioned, originally an *-ъkъ adjective.

22 This is actually the northern part of the present day Croatian Baranja, since Northern Baranja is today a part of southern Hungary.
to a.p. C'. In Slobodnica, the original a.p. A is preserved in čıl (čila – čilo), pūn, snēn, stăr; mēk, prāv, sīt, slāb, stīm, strōg, the shift to a.p. B is seen in nōv – nōva – nōvo (and spōr, vrēl, zrēl) and the innovative a.p. C(') in čīst, prōst, vjēšt; trūl, zdrāv. In Orubica, the situation is the most complex and innovative. There, a.p. A is preserved by pūn, slāb, smēd, spōr, strōg, trūl, zrēl, while the other adjectives (čīst, nōv, prāv, prōst, sīt, stăr, tāšt, tīh, zdrāv, žōk ‘bitter’) shift to all kinds of combinations and mixes of the original a.p. A and the newer a.p. B and C' with a great deal of vacillation and alternative forms. It is interesting that the adj. čīst loses the original a.p. A in all dialects except for Šaptinovac and Budrovci.

The shift to a.p. C', in spite of the preservation and further spread of the original a.p. C in many Western Štokavian (and Čakavian) dialects, may seem unmotivated, since there is only one old short vowel a.p. c adjective in Croatian: bōs – bōsa – bōso and, even there, nom. sg. m. of a.p. C is different from nom. sg. m. of a.p. A (bōs ≠ čīst). Of course, adjectives like glādan of a.p. C type are much more numerous. The distinction in nom. sg. m. forms remains even when innovative forms such as čīsta appear. The situation in Neretvanska krajina, where adjectives like dūg have a.p. C' pattern, but bōs belongs to a.p. B' (see above), shows that the only monosyllabic a.p. C adjective (bōs) did not take part in the a.p. A > C' shift. It must have been a part of a wider tendency of generalization of mobile accentuation in adjectives.

This process could perhaps be explained as a result of the general hegemony of the a.p. C type in adjectives in the dialects under discussion, i.e. considering -an and -ak adjectives, etc. as well. It is also possible that we are not dealing with the shift of a.p. A > a.p. C' but instead with a more complex shift of a.p. A > B > C', i.e. the pattern čīst – čīsta – čīsto (C') would be a result of the change from older čīst – čīsta – čīsto (B), which would, in turn, be from older čīst – čīsta – čīsto (A). This possible process of A > B > C', however, does not completely explain the appearance of the new a.p. C type here, in spite of the bōs ≠ čīst relation. In addition, it is perhaps too complicated to assume two phases of innovation (A > B > C)

---

23 The adj. mǎł shifted to a.p. B: (māla – mālo) and lōş has a vacillation, i.e. a.p. B/C (lōş – lōša – lōśo / lōšo).
instead of one, since these are in other aspects rather archaic dialects. It seems that the lengthening in nom. sg. m., typical for the original a.p. C, was not considered an obstacle for the new accentual mobility to develop in adjectives that were previously immobile.

In most cases, the old accent of definite adjectives is preserved (e.g. mȉlī, sȉtī, slȁbī, smjȅlī ‘courageous’, zdrȁvī, trȗlī, sȉtī), but in some cases, the original form (čȉstī) can have a variant or can be completely replaced by the secondary a.p. C type accent (čȉstī).\(^{24}\) Cf. also dȗgī ‘long’ (beside dȗgī). It is interesting that the original a.p. C accent ‘ˇ’ is lost in many dialects (thus one has bȕsī, drȃgī ‘dear’ instead of the older bòsī, dràgī) so in some dialects there can be a peculiar situation that the type ‘ˇ’ exists only in original a.p. a adjectives such as dȗgī. The old short vowel a.p. b adjectives mostly retain the original root accent ‘ˇ’ in long forms (prȕsī, nòvī, spȍrī, lȍšī, etc.). Accentual type like čȉstī is not a result of the influence of forms like bȕsī / drȁgī (original a.p. C) in all dialects. Since this accentual type is lost in many dialects, that kind of influence would be very unlikely in some of them. The spread of the new ‘ˇ’ type in a.p. A can also be due to analogy to younger (A > B) indefinite forms like čȉsta, čȉsto or to čȉsta, čȉsto (A > C'). For instance, in the Posavian dialects of Kobaš and Sikerevci that preserve the original a.p. A in nearly all adjectives, it is very indicative that the type ‘ˇ’ is found only in the definite form of čȉst, which is practically the only root adjective that has shifted to a.p. C’ in those dialects.\(^{25}\) Of course, the rise of the innovative ‘ˇ’ type in the original a.p. A may differ in various dialects.

Ivšić (1913 2, 49) notes the original type gȍlī, nòvī but also the innovative type nova, as well as čȉstī and čȉstī (like bȕsī / bòsī) for Posavina. For Šaptinovac Ivšić (1907, 142) gives the preserved a.p. A (čȉst – čȉsta – čȉsto) but also a generalized innovative type of the def. čȉstī, slabī, zdravī. According to Ivšić, the shift in def. adjectives occurred in all cases in Šaptinovac and not just in some of them, as is the situation elsewhere. Since a.p. A is preserved in indef. adjectives in Šaptinovac, the accent type of čȉstī should probably be attributed to analogy to the original a.p. C forms suvī

\(^{24}\) Cf. also pȑvī → pȑvī ‘first’.

\(^{25}\) In Slobodnica, most of the adjectives remain in a.p. A but a considerable number shifts to a.p. B and C. Still, only the form čȉstī has such an innovative accent. All other examples have the original accent, cf. čīlī, stȅmī, prȍstī, snȅnī, spȍrī, etc.
'dry' and ȫutȋ ‘mad’ although it is not clear why -ɪ would be generalized in all a.p. A adjectives, at least according to Ivšić’s not-so-explicit description, while it is attested in only two of the original a.p. c reflexes. As for Kostrč in Bosanska Posavina, Baotić (1979, 196–197) does not explicitly say what kind of accent appears in a.p. A definite forms, but it seems that they tend to keep the stem accent. As for original a.p. a and short vowel a.p. b adjectives that have shifted to a.p. C’, their def. forms have either final accentuation only (i.e. -ɪ, -â, -ô) or final accentuation alongside the original variant (i.e. stem stress). The shift to the a.p. C def. stress pattern occurs in most adjectives in Neretvanska krajina as well. Šimundić (1971, 137) has both older forms like čȉstī and younger like čìstī but claims that the latter are more frequent. In Prapatnice (Vrgorska krajina), like in Dobranje and Vidonje, it seems that all or most adjectives behave like čistī, sitī, etc. except mȉlī, nȍvī, which preserve the original pattern. In Prapatnice, forms like čìstī appear beside the new a.p. C’ (čist – čista – čisto) so one can suppose analogy of the indef. čìstā to the def. čistā, but original a.p. C forms such as bòsī, br𝑧ī, gùstī, etc. could also be an important source of analogy, since they are well preserved in the dialect. The innovative ˇ- type also appears in a.p. B, cf. the def. gòlā with the indef. gòla. Budmani (1883, 173) notes čìstī for Dubrovnik and the same pattern for all other adjectives with ˇ in at least some indef. forms (except for nov – similar to Prapatnice and Dobranje / Vidonje), cf. also dȫgī (Rešetar 1900, 129). In Dubrovnik,

26 The innovative -ɪ also appears in all adjectives with suffixes that belong to the synchronic a.p. C – mokrȋ ‘wet’, toplȋ ‘warm’, sretnȋ ‘happy’, tankȋ ‘thin’. The only example of those in which one would historically expect desinential stress in the definite form is tankȋ. This could be a case of analogy to examples like the latter, but there is too little data to be certain. Synchronically, the accent of the def. f. mokrȃ can hardly be due to analogy to the indef. f. mokie. Such an analogy works perfectly in Neo-Štokavian where the indef. mòkra can easily influence the def. mȍkrȃ the result being the newer def. form mokrȃ. However, in Old Štokavian, with no stress retraction (and with kanovačko lengthening in Šaptinovac as well), such an analogy does not work. One could perhaps suppose the analogy of the def. form mokrȃ to the old *mokrȃ (the proto-form of today’s mókra).

27 For the villages of Dobranje and Vidonje Vidović (2007, 203) gives only tihȋ (cf. also the old gùstȋ, etc. in a.p. C) but such accentuation is present in other examples as well (čistī, dȫgī, lȫšī, prȫstī, sītī, zdrȃvī, etc.), except for nȍvī and mȉlī, which preserve the old accent (Domagoj Vidović, private communication).
the A > C’ shift in def. adjectives may have to do with the same sort of pattern shift in the indef. forms but not necessarily – in some dialects, forms like $dùgī$ appear alongside $dùg – dùga – dùgo$ (B). In Molise (Piccoli, Sammartino 2000), one finds older (def. $nòvî, pûnî, zdrâvî, zrîli, žûki$) but also younger forms ($dùgī$, gen. sg. m. $dùgôga$ but f. $dùga$, gen. sg. f. $dùge$), as well as peculiar forms like the def. $čîsti$, -$a$, méki, -$a$ ‘soft’ (gen. sg. m. $mêkôga$ but gen. sg. f. $mêke$).²⁸

In four original a.p. a adjectives an unusual a.p. B: definite pattern is found. Cf. the indef. forms $pràv$, rânn ‘early’, stâr, màô ‘small’ ($màla – màlo$, ARj) and the adverbs $pràvo$ ‘right’, râno ‘early’, màlo ‘little’ but the def. forms $pràvî$, rânî,³⁰ stârî, which derive from the older forms $prâvî$, rânî, màlî, stârî, attested with the neo-acute in Posavina (Ivšić 1913 2, 50) and in other Štokavian dialects that preserve the neo-acute (like in Poljica near Omiš). These adjectives have neo-acute in Čakavian as well (see below). Thus, this is not a case of the old neo-circumflex that appears in Kajkavian or in North Čakavian ($mâlî$, etc.), as some wrongly think. It should also be emphasized that all Štokavian (and South and Central Čakavian) dialects seem to have such stress, which clearly points to an old innovation. Some Štokavian dialects distinguish the forms $prâvî$ and $prâvī / prȃvî$,³¹ while the secondary type B: can spread to other adjectives as well, cf. $zdrâvî / zdrȃvî$ and $slȃbī / slȃbî$ in Imotska krajina and Bekija (Šimundić 1971, 137).³² There is also the younger form $kȃsnî$ ‘late’ that

---

²⁸ The forms $čîsti$, méki could be derived from *čîstiti, *mekitä but the supposed shortening of the final syllable is unexpected.

²⁹ In some dialects, the variant with the expected " exists as well (for instance in Osijek, cf. Benič 2007, 24). This can either be original or a back-formation by analogy to the indef. forms.

³⁰ The length can be transferred to the indef. form as well, cf. māl. However, in many dialects only the def. form mālî exists, while in others, like Prapatnice, the def. and indef. forms are distinguished by accent alone – cf. the indef. mālî (but the def. mālî), māla, mālo (a.p. B:).


³² In Molise, in the example mālî a usual, typically Molisean, shortening occurs in gen. sg. m. form māloga but not in stârî – gen. sg. m. stâroga. Cf. also below for other examples of such a shortening in Molise.
exists in some dialects beside the older kāsnī, which is probably due to analogy with rānī ‘early’.

Although it is quite clear that in these cases we are dealing with secondary forms and an analogy to the a.p. B: type, the reason for such an analogy specifically in these adjectives is not too clear. Perhaps it is not accidental that all primary examples have a resonant (-v-, -n-, -l-, -r-) as the final consonant of the stem. However, cf. also zdrāvī (but dialectally zdrāvī as well), pūnī and mīlī with no lengthening. One may also surmise that the same unusual lengthening before -v- is found in the form prīvī ‘first’ instead of pȑvī, although in this case this is just a variant that exists in some (but not all) Štokavian dialects.

In compound adjectives with a linking -o- and zero suffix, there is a tendency (relatively young) for the accent to shift from the middle -ò- (which is the original place of stress in most cases) to the very first syllable, while leaving the syllable after -o- long. Cf. gològlav ‘bareheaded’ > gòloglāv, bosònog ‘barefoot’ > bōsonōg. The same kind of change occurs in nouns that are derived in the same manner (although the younger accent is more frequent in nouns than in adjectives): sudòper ‘dish-washer’ > sōdopēr, kamenòlom ‘quarry’ > kāmenolōm, etc.

ČAKAVIAN (Orbanići)\(^{33}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čȉs</td>
<td>čȉsta</td>
<td>čȉsto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čȉsti</td>
<td>čȉsta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Čakavian, archaic dialects maintain a.p. A (< Proto-Slavic a.p. a and short vowel a.p. b), while others show a shift (partial or general) to a.p. C’. There is no shift to a.p. B, as in some Štokavian dialects, since a.p. C is dominant in Čakavian (cf. also the shift B > C below). Such a situation in the Čakavian South is a continuation of a similar situation in Dalmatian West Štokavian dialects. One other thing that distinguishes Čakavian from Štokavian is that in Čakavian a.p. A (or what becomes of it) the def. adj. type -i accent is less frequent than in Štokavian. This is hardly strange, since this type of accent is much less frequent in Čakavian in a.p. C as well, where

---

\(^{33}\) Kalsbeek 1998, 429.
it would be expected historically, so it is no wonder that it could not have influenced a.p. A in that regard.

There are two basic types of developments in Čakavian. One group of dialects preserves the original a.p. A, while the other shows partial or complete transfer of monosyllabic adjectives to a.p. C[]. Definite forms usually have the original stem stress.

The first, archaic, group is represented, for example, by Hvar\(^35\) čȉst – čȉsta (and čȉstȃ, there is no mention of such a variant for other adjectives\(^36\)) – čȉsto, constant stem stress also in dȗg, sȉt, tȉh, slȁb (slȁba),\(^37\) lȍš, nȍv, trȕm, def. čȉsti, etc.;\(^38\) Filipjakov\(^39\) čȉst – čȉsta – čȉsto (the same in slȁb, sȉt, prȕst, spȕr, while the length from nom. sg. m. is generalized in all forms in nȕv – nȕva – nȕvo); Preko\(^40\) čȉst – čȉsta – čȉsto (the same in sȉt, nȍv, prȕst, spȕr, while slȁb – slȁba – slȁbo has generalized the lengthening from the f. and n.); Pag\(^41\) brȅja f. ‘with young (of animals)’, dȗg – dȕga – dȕgo – def. dȕgi, ślȁb – ślȁba – ślȁbo – def. ślȁbi ‘weak’, nȕov – nȕva – nȕvo – def. nȕvi, źȕk – źȕka – źȕko – def. źȕki ‘bitter’, etc.;\(^42\) Susak\(^43\) dâľχ – dâľχa – dâľχo – def. dâľχi ‘long’ (nȕf, pȗn, slȁp, syȕ, tȃšć, zdrȁf also belong to a.p. A); Senj\(^44\) lȍš – lȍša – lȍšo (the same pattern in čȉst, sȉt, slȁb, pȗn, zrȅl, prȕst, nȕv), def. lȍši etc; Orlec\(^45\) stȃr – stȃra – stȃro, čȉst, slȁp, sȉt; Rijeka\(^46\) dȗh ‘long’, pȗn, sȉt, slȁb, stȃr, tȉh, zdrȃv (constant

---

\(^34\) Of course, there are exceptions. Cf. novȕ in Novi Vinodolski (the very name of the town is also Novȕ).

\(^35\) Hraşt 1935, 32; ČDL.

\(^36\) ČDL gives only čȉsta for the dialect of Brusje on the island of Hvar.

\(^37\) In ČDL, the data given for Hvar in general is slȁb (cf. slȕb in Brač), -a, -o (i.e. +slȕba, +slȕbo if not a mistake).


\(^39\) Near Zadar, data by Nikola Vuletić.

\(^40\) On the island of Ugljan, data by Nikola Vuletić.

\(^41\) Kustić 2002, 62.

\(^42\) The final closed syllable is lengthened on Pag, cf. also the nouns brȕȕt ‘brother’, nar’ȕd ‘people’ (Kustić 2002, 50–51).

\(^43\) Hamm, Hraşt, Guberina 1956, 113–114.

\(^44\) Moguš 1966, 76.

\(^45\) Houtzagers 1985, 117–119.

\(^46\) Strohal 1895, 158.
root stress) and \( zr\ell - +zr\ell a, n\ov - +n\ova; \) Orbani\'ci\textsuperscript{47} \( zd\ravf - zd\rava - zd\ravo, n^\text{o}\ovf - n\ova, p\un - p\una, sl\ap - sl\aba, s\it - s\ita, s\ar - s\ara, \) etc. In Grobnik,\textsuperscript{48} the original pattern is preserved in \( s\it (-a, -o, \text{also } d\ug, r\uad \text{`glad'}, sl\ab, s\vêm \text{`steep'}, s\ar - s\ara - s\aro (\text{also } m\il, p\un, tr\uul \text{`rotten'}, vr\el \text{‘boiling'}, zd\rav, zr\ell \text{‘ripe'}, \) but there is a shift in \( c\ist - c\ist\a - c\isto \) (also \( s\krt, t\âsc \text{‘slim, empty'}).\textsuperscript{49} The original a.p. A occurs, as we have seen, in all of the Čakavian territory, from the South to the North.

On Vrgada (Jurišić 1966, 82–83; 1973) there is a transitional system with a group of adjectives preserving the original pattern (\( hr\ôm, -a, -o, \) the same in \( l\ôš, t\ih, pr\av, \) all a.p. A), a group with variant stress (\( zd\rôav - zd\rav\a / zd\rava, z\uk - z\ûka / z\uk\a - z\uko, \) a.p. A/C') and a group with complete shift to a.p. C' (\( c\ist - c\ist\a, \) acc. sg. f. \( c\istu - c\isto, \) the same in \( d\ug, sl\ab, s\it, s\vêm, t\âsc \) and \( p\un, s\ar \). In definite forms, the original pattern can be preserved (\( m\il\i, n\ov\i \)), but there are also innovative forms with desinential stress (\( c\ist\i, dug\i \)). On Brač (Šimunović 2009, 44), as opposed to the more archaic Hvar, there is a vacillation of a.p. A/C' in the adjectives \( d\ug, t\ih, s\it, t\rôm, pr\ôst (\) the last adjective belongs to a.p. A only in the dictionary\), while the other group of adjectives has the younger a.p. C' only: \( n\ov - n\ov\a - n\ovo, \) the same in \( zd\rôv - zd\rav\a - zd\ravo, vr\il, zd\rîl \text{‘ripe'}, p\un, sl\ôb (\) cf. the long forms: \( d\ûgi, n\ôvi, t\îhi, t\rômi, pr\ôsti, zd\râvi, vrîli \)).\textsuperscript{50} For the younger \(-î\) in the definite forms of adjectives in Čakavian a.p. A, cf. for instance Novi Vinodolski \( c\isî\u (\text{next to } c\isî), \) Krasica \( sl\ab\a \) (Langston 2006, 184–185).

As in Štokavian, South Čakavian also shows the unexpected \( ^{\sim} \) in a.p. A of some adjectives, cf. Vrgada (Jurišić 1973) \( m\ôlî, pr\ôv\i, s\ô\âr\i, r\ô\ânî \) and Brač (Šimunović 2009) \( m\ôlî, pr\ôvî, st\ôrî, r\ônî (\text{but } zd\rôvî < *zd\ravî), \) which is in complete agreement with Štokavian.

\textsuperscript{47} Kalsbeek 1998, 143–144.
\textsuperscript{48} Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 95, 100–101, 105.
\textsuperscript{49} As for the reflex of the old short vowel a.p. \( b \) in Grobnik, cf. \( n\ov - n\ov\a - n\ovo (\) C and pr\ôst - prost\a - prôsto (\) ‘usual, simple’ as well as prôst - prost\a - prôsto (\( C' < \) *A) ‘rude’ in a.p. C but trôm - trôma - trômo ‘inert’ (A).
\textsuperscript{50} In the dictionary, the accent \( s\ita \) is noted as stemming from Bol and \( s\it\a \) as from Dračevica.
\textsuperscript{51} For Pučišća on Brač (Domagoj Vidović, p.c.) cf. \( d\ug \) in a.p. A/C' (\( d\ug / d\ug - d\ûga / dug\a - dug\o \) and only a.p. C' elsewhere (\( p\un - p\una - p\uno, pr\ôst - prost\a - prôsto, etc.). Def. adj. have root stress (\( d\ûgi, s\ûti, trômi, n\ôvi, etc.).
In Senj (Moguš 1966, 76), such an accent appears in several other adjectives as well: nôvi, prâvi, zdrâvi. In the North of the Čakavian territory, these adjectives have neo-circumflex (which appears in all a.p. A adjectives in Kajkavian, Slovene and some North Čakavian dialects); cf. Novi Vinodolski (Langston 2006, 184): stârī but dügī, mîlī, sîtī, sîlâbī, etc., Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998, 144) mâli, prâvi, stârī, rânī (and the indef. rân by analogy) but not in other adjectives: dügī, mîlī, ūhi, etc. The Orbanići form kâsan ‘late’ has the circumflex probably by analogy to the older def. form *kâsni (the present day def. form is the secondary kâsni, shaped by analogy to the new indef. form kâsan). In Orlec (Houtzagers 1985, 118), only two adjectives, which have secondary neo-acute in the South, have neo-circumflex: mâli and prâvi (cf. stârī < *stârī, rânī < *rânī). As already pointed out regarding Štokavian, the reason for the occurrence of such a secondary accent in these specific adjectives is not clear – perhaps it is due only to their frequency, which was the reason for the (slightly paradoxical) analogical a.p. B: accent in the South, while in the North the old neo-circumflex was preserved in these same adjectives (the neo-circumflex might have been the feature of all a.p. A adjectives originally as is still the case in some dialects).


It is not certain what the original situation was like concerning the neo-circumflex in definite a.p. A adjective forms in the North of the Čakavian territory or if there was any unity there to begin with. Some dialects, like Kastav, have the length in all a.p. A definite forms, like Kajkavian

---

52 These two forms could also theoretically derive from the older *stârī and *rânī.
and Slovene, while others, like the dialect of Novi Vinodolski, have it in traces only. One possibility is that originally all (or most) of the Northern Čakavian dialects had the neo-circumflex in a.p. A def. adj. forms – a feature that was later lost in many dialects by analogy to indef. forms. The other possibility is that in some dialects the neo-circumflex was never present in all adjectives. The difference between Čakavian North and Slovene / Kajkavian is that Čakavian has the neo-circumflex while at the same time preserving posttonic length (of course, in dialects that preserve it in other cases as well). Here, there are once more two possibilities. One is that this posttonic length was never lost during the process of the neo-circumflex lengthening and the other is that it was lost but then restored by analogy to a.p. B and a.p. C, where the preservation would be expected in any case.

**KAJKAVIAN (Velika Rakovica)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sȉt</td>
<td>sȉta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reflexes of the Proto-Slavic a.p. a in Kajkavian are clear. The reflex is a synchronic a.p. A in all dialects, which means the constant root stress in indef. forms and, typical for Kajkavian and Slovene, the neo-circumflex in def. forms. Thus in most archaic Kajkavian dialects, the indef. forms are čȉst – čȉsta – čȉsto and the def. ones are čı̈sti – čı̈sta – čı̈sto. The neo-circumflex is attributed to the old contraction length in the ending, cf. Štok. čȉstī – čȉsta – čȉstō from PSl. *čı̋stъjь > *čīstyjь > *čȉstī, etc. In some less archaic Kajk. dialects, the neo-circumflex may be replaced by an analogical ̏ from the indef. forms, i.e. def. čȉsti by analogy to the indef. čȉst. Other changes (like the spread of the a.p. B: type in V. Rakovica) are less frequent.

Cf. in Bednja (Jedvaj 1956, 304–305) čȉst**55** – def. čȅisti, the same in slȊb, sȉt, stȊr, zdrȊv, dȊg, mȋl, mȊl ‘little’. In polysyllabic adjectives, the

---

**53** March 1981, 265.

**54** Jedvaj 1956, 305. The V. Rakovica forms sȉti – sȉta – sȉto are secondary.

**55** In Bednja, only nom. sg. m. exists as a separate indef. form. In all other cases, the def. forms are used (Jedvaj 1956, 303).
neo-circumflex appears in internal syllables, e.g. in sērdȉt – sedȇiti ‘angry’, kȳēsmȍt – kesmȃoti ‘hairy’ but not in first syllable: hrȫpov(i) ‘coarse’, šȁpov(i) ‘lame’, etc.\(^{56}\)

In Velika Rakovica (March 1981, 265–266): sȉt – sȉta – sȉto, the same in pun, mal, dug, mil, prav, star, zdrav, trul, zrel and nov. The def. forms have an innovative neo-acute (def. sȉti, etc.), taken from a.p. B:. The same situation is found in the polysyllabic adjectives: bogȁt – bogȁta – bogȁto, the same pattern in gotȍv ‘finished’, strplȉv ‘patient’, etc., cf. the secondary def. forms bogãti, etc. For the reflexes of the old short a.p. b see below.

In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002), cf. zdrȁf (f. and n. forms zdrȁva and zdrȁvo are irrelevant due to the retraction that occurs in the dialect, cf. nȍga ‘leg’, vȍda ‘water’, žȅna ‘woman’), indef. nom. pl. f. zrȅlȍ ‘ripe’ – def. nom. sg. m. zrȅli and gologlȁf ‘with no hat’ – def. gologlȃvi but also brȫj – brȫja – brȫjo, slȁp – slȁba – slȁbo – def. slȁbi (the same in sȉt). In the last three adjectives, one sees curious cases of levelling, with secondary ̑ in the indef. nom. sg. m. due to the old def. forms, while the def. forms have the secondary ̀ from the old indef. forms. The neo-circumflex is well preserved in the adjectives that have def. forms only: čȉsti, tȉhi, stȃr, mȁli (adverb mȁlo), prȃvi, rȃni, vrȅli, dȍgi, mȉli, etc.

Rožić (1893–1894 2, 141–144, 147–148, 152, 166) asserts that in Prigorje, unlike Štok., it is impossible to distinguish def. and indef. forms by accent alone (i.e. that there is no pattern of indef. zdrȃv – def. zdrȃvi). In his description of Prigorje, one finds the pattern: zdrȃv – zdrȃva – zdrȃvo (in oblique cases, older forms like zdrȃvega go together with newer forms like zdravȅga).\(^{57}\) The following adjectives have this pattern as well: slȃb, čȉst, dȕg, pȗn, sȉt, stȃr (but f. stȃra / stȃra – here, the trace of the old neo-circumflex from the def. forms is preserved), ūj ‘quiet’, zrȅl, brȫj. Cf. also in polysyllabic adjectives: bȫgat – f. bogȫta – n. bogȫti (-i instead of -o), sȫdìt – f. srdȉta. In some adjectives, the old ̀ from the old def. forms appears: rȃn – f. rȃna – n. rȃni (instead of -o), mȋl – f. mȉla – n. mȉlo.\(^{58}\) Here, the f. and n. forms were originally def. forms. Such a situation is found in pȫjan –

---

\(^{56}\) In this position, the neo-circumflex is probably not to be expected in any case.

\(^{57}\) Rožić’s accentual marks are adapted in this article. The mark ˝ is used for his ‘ and ˜ for his ‘.

\(^{58}\) The form mȁl has the secondary forms mála, málo in f. and n.
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f. pijâna / pijâna – n. pijâni / pijâni (instead of -o) ‘drunk’ next to the old indef. forms, as well as in kòsmat, giždav ‘gaudy’, pišiv ‘crummy’. The old neo-circumflex has been generalized in all forms in kamenît – f. kamenîta – n. kamenîti and ḳ is found in denominative adjectives like ļetni ‘summer’, krûšni ‘bread’, etc. that have def. forms only.

In Ozalj (Težak 1981, 268, 270), Proto-Slavic a.p. a adjectives form three groups now. The first one preserves the original pattern: mȁl – mȁla – mȁlo – def. mȁli. The other adjectives are dȗk ‘long’, mȗl, prȗf ‘real’, stȃr, zdrȃf, zrȅl and polysyllabic dugovrȃt ‘long neck’, črlenkȃst ‘reddish’, gologlȃf, etc. In the other group, the def. forms have the innovative “ from the indef. forms: sȉt – sȉta – sȉto – def. sȉti and the same in pȗn, trȗl, vrȅl, vȗl and brdovȉt ‘hilly’, žȗckast ‘yellowish’, mȗšaf ‘skinny’, etc. The third, smallest group, has transferred to a.p. C’ and has the same pattern as gòl – gòla (< *golȁ) – gòlo ‘naked’. The adjectives are slȁp ‘weak’, plȁh and ĉȉst (the latter preserves the original def. accent in the phrase Čȉsta srȉda ‘Ash Wednesday’). Def. forms in Ozalj have ḳ, but this can be either the original a.p. a neo-circumflex or a reflex of the old neo-acute from a.p. B: (this pattern spreads to a.p. C as well).

In Turopolje (Šojat 1982, 400), def. forms lose the neo-circumflex and the pattern is dȕk – dȕgi ‘long’ (the same in zdrȃf, čȉst). The adjectives stȃr and slȁp ‘weak’ can shift to a.p. C (stȃr, slȃp), probably due to analogy to the old def. forms that had the neo-circumflex. An interesting development is seen in the secondary indef. form mâli, which has the old def. accent, while the new def. form has the secondary neo-acute: mâli (cf. in Prapatnice Štok. indef. mâli but def. mâlî).

As we have seen, in Štoko, the old short vowel a.p. b has the same reflex as the old a.p. a. However, the situation with the old short vowel a.p. b is not as clear in Kajkavian, one of the reasons being the lack of data. In V. Rakovica, only three adjectives are attested. The adj. nov is a.p. A (like sȉt, etc.), while prost and loš are a.p. C’, next to gȍl – golȃ – gȍlo (originally also a.p. b). In Bednja, Jedvaj gives only the adj. nȫev (def. nȫevi) ‘new’, which is in a.p. C (next to a whole slew of the original a.p. b adjectives such as žȫut ‘yellow’ and gȗel ‘naked’). In Turopolje, the one form nȏv – nȏva (cf. also bȏs – bȏsa / bȏsa, originally a.p. c) tells us nothing, just like Rožić’s two adjectives from Prigorje that belong to a.p. C: nȏv – nȏva – nȏvo (the
same in *prőst*). In Težak’s Ozalj, *nôf* ‘new’ belongs to a.p. A together with *m ál* (def. *m ál i*); *l ôj š* ‘bad’ and *spôr* are in a.p. C’ (like *g ôl* – *g ôla* – *g ôlo* – def. *g ôli*) and *pr ôst* is in a.p. C: (having the same pattern as *l îp* – *l îpa* – *l îpo* ‘beautiful’). In Varaždin (L i p l j i n 2002), one finds only the def. *l ôš i* (which seems to be an innovative a.p. A form) and *n ôvi*, *l ôš i* (which do not point to a.p. A). According to what we have seen, it is not clear whether the process of merger of the old a.p. a and short vowel a.p. b, which is visible in Štok/Čak. (with the exception of *g oł ţ* that remains in a.p. B), can be attributed to Kajkavian as well. In Slovene, there is no such merger (see below). However, the situation in Križanić’s dialect points to a process similar to that in Štok/Čak. (setting the problem of the phonetic reflex of the old acute and short neo-acute aside).

In Križanić’s dialect, the shift of the old short vowel a.p. b adjectives to a.p. A is clear, unlike elsewhere in Kajk., cf. *l ôš i* – *l ôše*, *H ôv* – nom. pl. m. *n ôvi* – nom. dual n. *n ôwa* (cf. def. *H ôvi*), etc. However, one thing is interesting in Križanić’s dialect. According to the Russian accentological school,59 the reflex of the old acute (´ in Križanić’s texts) and the old short neo-acute (´ in Križanić’s texts) is different in monosyllabic words in prepausal position. Cf. the words *brâm* ‘brother’, *mrâz* ‘frost’, *bîć* ‘whip’, *ràj* ‘heaven’, *ptîuč* ‘bird’, *xliô* ‘bread’, *ćàp* ‘emperor’, etc. (all from the old acute, a.p. a) but *cân* ‘dream’, *krôv* ‘roof’, *vôl* ‘ox’, *s ön* ‘catfish’, *dôjspó* ‘rain’, *kôn* ‘horse’, *k ôš* ‘basket’, etc. (all from the old short neo-acute, a.p. b). This distinction is neutralized in non-prepausal positions and in polysyllabic words, cf. both *jêzîk* and *jêzîk* ‘language, tongue’. The distinction is seen in adjectives as well, albeit with much more vacillation than in nouns. Cf. *dôlôg* ‘long’, *m ál*, *slâb*, *St màp*, *zdráw* (but *Kîñàst* ‘lame’ and *Hînuč / Hînuč* vs. *z ôl* ‘evil’, *l ôsh*, *H ôv*, *Xrôm*, *T ôuč* (with variants with ´: *z ôl*, *chrôm*,60 *T ôuč*, while *Skôr* is written with ´ only).

Alternatively, this distinction might be explained as graphic only, but the exact distribution of the accent marks is hard to explain in this way. The other possibility would be that these signs were intended to point to different accentual patterns in other forms, for instance the distinction of

59 Д ý b o 1968, 221; O s l o n 2011.
60 This adjective seems to belong to a synchronic a.p. B (cf. nom. pl. m. *Xromî*, gen. pl. *chromîch*).
This suggestion might work for nouns but not so much for adjectives since there the old short vowel a.p. b has the same immobile root stress as the original a.p. a, cf. nôwo = Cmápo. However, the variants of ˊ / ˋ (зòл / zól) that exist in almost all of the old short vowel a.p. b adjectives and in some old a.p. a ones might be significant. This could point to the relation of these graphic signs with the type of accentual paradigmatic patterns even if these signs indeed represent different phonetic tones with different historical background. The third option would be that these are just some sort of allotones on different vowels since the old acute and old short neo-acute do not usually appear on the same vowels. However, words like cân and ñápâm speak against such a suggestion (even though such words are expectedly rare).

In any case, it seems reasonable to assume that the original distinction of the acute and the short neo-acute could be maintained in monosyllabic nouns in prepausal positions in Križanić’s texts (of course, this would point to the fact that such a distinction had previously existed in other positions as well). However, this is problematic when one considers the interpretation of the obvious fact that the original short vowel a.p. b shifts to a.p. A in all Štok/Čak. dialects (and apparently in Križanić’s dialect as well). Such a shift (although unusual by itself considering it was quite early) can hardly be explained if we take into account Križanić’s data where the equation of čȉst = nöm, unlike elsewhere, does not hold true. Perhaps this could be explained by the fact that the old acute and old short neo-acute have functioned in some sort of complementary distribution since the Proto- or Common Slavic period. The old acute was present on long vowels only and the short neo-acute on short vowels only. Thus, the short neo-acute (or some other prosodeme with the same reflex in later dialects) functioned as a sort of ‘replacement’ of the old acute on short vowels. We see this in prefixal derivatives like *sósȅdь ‘neighbor’ – they had the old acute if the root was long but the short neo-acute (or some sort of tone that has the same

---

61 One could perhaps assume that Križanić found it easier to distinguish ˊ from ˋ if there was a distinction in other forms as well. Križanić might have understood the connection of ˊ with constant root stress and the connection of ˋ with the post-stem stress, even if these tones were indeed different in pronunciation. This may also point to a gradual dissapearance of this distinction in Križanić’s dialect.
reflex) if the root was short, for instance in *potòkъ ‘brook’. Therefore, it is perhaps not too strange that the phonetic distinction of čist and nov could be preserved even if these two phonetic realizations (that usually appeared on different vowels in any case) were functionally the same prosodeme. In that case, the analogy to *čȉst – *čȉsta – *čȉsto may have caused the appearance of the innovative *nȍva – *nȍvo instead of the older *novȁ – *novȍ in spite of the fact that *nȍv was phonetically different from *čȉst. Besides, one should point out that the accent of the old a.p. a and short vowel a.p. b was the same in the def. forms (see below), which may have had some influence.

Cf. in Slovene:

šit – šita – šito – def. šiti

Slovene is different from Kajkavian in that it has the neo-circumflex in most adjectives in the indef. nom. sg. f. (due to the same kind of logic that causes the neo-circumflex to appear in some ā-stems derivatives and in feminine participle forms) and not just in def. forms. Cf. bógat (< *bogât) – bogâta – bogâto for polysyllabic adjectives. However, there is no change in some adjectives, cf. the indef. stára, ráda, čista (also siva, which is a.p. b originally). Unlike Štok. and Čak., the adjectives of the type of nȍv and hrȍm (the old short vowel a.p. b) remain in a.p. B, i.e. there is no merger with a.p. A – nȍva but šita.

a.p. A:63 br’ed with young (of animals), c’ič,64 č’il astir, č’ist clean (cf. the Stand. Croat. verb čȉstiti clean),65 d’ug long, h’rl eager (> B:, cf. hȳliti rush joyfully), hr’om lame (< *B), ’istī same (> istī C, cf. īstina truth), klj’ast game, lame, k’rt crisp, l’ak easy, light (PSl. b, originally an *-ъkъ adj., dial. lagak), l’oš bad (< *B), m’al small (> B:, def. B:, cf. the adverbs

---

62 Breznik 1924, 94; Stankiewicz 1993, 65.
63 The words in word-lists are written in some sort of (Štok.) ‘prototype’ forms, with ě for different reflexes of the yat and with non-vocalized final -l, thus směl and not smio, etc.
64 Usually only in the phrase cȑćā zīma ‘freezing cold’ but cf. also B a o t ić 1979, 196.
65 In the brackets, we give cognate words (in their Standard Croatian form) to show if a certain adjective belongs to the original a.p. a (with cognate words having constant ”) or not.
mȁlo ‘little, bit’ – zàmalo ‘almost’), m’ek soft (also C:, PSl. c, originally an *-ъkъ adj., dial. mekak), m’il pleasant (cf. mȉliti se feel like doing something), mn’ogī many (cf. mnȰžiti multiply), m’rk glum, n’ov new (< *B, cf. obnòviti renew), pl’ah timid (> C:, cf. plȁšiti scare), pr’av real (def. B:, cf. prȁvo right, pȰpraviti fix), pr’ost rude, simple (< *B, also C, PSl. b), p’rvī first (> C: B:), p’un full (cf. pȰniti fill), r’ad glad (cf. rȁdo gladly, rȁdovati rejoice), r’an early (> C:, def. B:, cf. rȁno early, rȁniti be early), r’id red haired (also C:), r’us red haired (also C:), s’it satiated (cf. nȁsititi se satiate), sk’on apt (< *B, cf. sklȍniti put away), sk’or soon to be, recent (< *B, cf. skòro soon, recently), sl’ab weak (cf. slȁbjeti grow weak), sm’ed brown (< *B, > B:), sm’él bold (cf. smjȅti may), sn’en sleepy, sp’or slow (< *B, cf. uspȍriti slow down),67 st’ar old (def. B:, cf. stȁrjeti grow old), st’rm stipe, str’og strict (< *B, cf. postròžiti stricten), sv’еж fresh (a loanword from Czech, cf. ȍsvježiti freshen up), šk’rt stingy (C: in Posavina),68 t’ašt vane (< *B, t’ih silent (> B:/C:)),69 tr’om inert (< *B), tr’ul rotten (cf. trȰliti rotten), ub’og poor (> ‘ubog), vȰšt accomplished (cf. vjȅštica witch), v’it slim, vr’el hot (for water) (cf. vrȅti), v’r’l brave, zdr’av healthy (def. A > B:, cf. ȍzdraviti get well / healthy), zn’an known (> B:/C:), zr’el70 ripe (cf. zrȅti), ž’uk bitter (originally an *-ъkъ adj., cf. the variant žuhak)

Note: etymologically, the old a.p. a and the old short vowel a.p. b adjectives are easy to distinguish since the latter always have one of the old short vowels in the root (*e, *o, *ь or *ъ), while the former have old long vowels (all other ones).

---

67 Since this is a prefixal derivation, one could expect also *sъpòrъ – *sъpora – *sъpòro with the constant a.p. a stress already in PSl. but examples like uspȍriti point to a.p. b (thus *sъpòrъ – *sъporà – *sъpòro).
68 Cf. for instance Sikerevci, Brodski Stupnik, Budrovci and Slobodnica škȰrt.
69 The length is probably always due to forms like tíj with the new -j, with a lengthening in front of -j (which is a regular phonetic rule in many dialects).
70 The adjectives trȍm, smȉo, vrȅo, zrȅo are originally participles of the verbs tȑti ‘crush’, smjȅti ‘may’, vrȅti ‘boil’, zrȅti ‘ripen’.
2. a.p. b

Proto-Slavic

short vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>indefinite adjectives</td>
<td>*gòlъ</td>
<td>*golá</td>
<td>*golò</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite adjectives</td>
<td>*gòlъjь</td>
<td>*golaja</td>
<td>*gòloje</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘naked’

long vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>indefinite adjectives</td>
<td>*žьltъ</td>
<td>*žьltá</td>
<td>*žьltó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite adjectives</td>
<td>*žьltъjь</td>
<td>*žьltaja</td>
<td>*žьltajoje</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘yellow’

The accentual pattern of the indef. a.p. b adj. in PSl. is simple. The stress is always on the syllable immediately following the stem (*gola, *golò), except in the cases where final *ers cannot be stressed (*gòlъ), i.e. the situation is the same as in nouns (*snòpъ ‘bundle’, gen. sg. *snopa, dat. sg. *snopu). Long forms are more problematic – all Slavic languages point to the neo-acute on the stem: *gòlъjь, *žьltъjь (Croat. gȍlī, dial. žūti). However, what is not clear is the origin of the neo-acute in this position. There are two possibilities – retraction by Ivšić’s Law (i.e. the retraction of the stress after the operation of Dybo’s Law) or the absence of Dybo’s Law. The supposed retraction by Ivšić’s (Stang’s) Law is often attributed to the contraction of the ending (*-ъ ̍ jь, *-a ̋ ja, *-o ̍ je) after Dybo’s Law, which would have caused the appearance of the non-initial falling accent (*-y, *-ȃ, *-ô). This accent would have then retracted to the preceding syllable as a neo-acute (the same as in *pȳtājete ‘you are asking’ > *pȳtȃte > Croat. dial. pȳtȁte).\

However, there are a number of problems with this explanation (Kapović 2005b, 34; Langston 2006, 270f). Firstly, the neo-acute on the stem is Pan-Slavic, which means that this pattern must be quite an early development. However, vowel contractions are anything but early and Pan-Slavic. The vowel contraction is a rather late development in Slavic, it is often absent in East Slavic and in other Slavic languages it occurs in various

\[71\] For such an explanation, cf. Stang 1957, 101–102.
ways and to various extent (cf. e.g. Croat. *bòjati se* ‘be afraid’ but Czech/Slv. *báti se*). To set the said theory into the realm of impossibilities even more, in Russian the nom/acc. sg/pl. endings are not contracted even today, cf. Russian nom/acc. sg. m. белый ‘white’, nom. sg. f. белая, acc. sg. f. белую, nom/acc. sg. n. белое, nom/acc. pl. белые. What is more, in Old Russian the contraction was not complete even in oblique cases. The late date of the contraction in def. adj. forms is clear from its results as well, which are different in various languages / dialects, cf. OCS *-ajego / -aago / -ago*, Croat. *-og(a)* (with the vocalism by analogy to the pronominal *-oga* < *-ogo* as in *togo* ‘of that’), Czech *-ého* (with a new long *-é*- and not a *yat*), Polish *-ego*, etc. From what has been said, it is clear that no contraction of any kind can explain the accent of the def. a.p. *b* adj. forms even if no other explanation is at hand.

Compared to a.p. *c*, the number of suffixless a.p. *b* adjectives is quite small. This is still a trait of a.p. *B* in those Croatian dialects that maintain the original B/C opposition.

Cf. in Russian:
бел – белá – белó (def. белый)

Only a few monosyllabic (suffixless) adjectives remain in a.p. *B* in Russian. Some of the synchronic a.p. *B* adjectives are historically secondary (like стар), while many show a variant shift to a.p. *C* (cf. the above-mentioned older белó and younger бело and белы / белы in pl.).

---

72 For the contraction in Slavic, cf. for instance Marvan 2000.
73 This, however, does not bother Kortlandt (2005, 127) for some reason, who explains the neo-acute on the root via contraction and retraction while completely disregarding previously mentioned obvious facts concerning those processes. Still, one must note that, if the said contraction were Proto-Slavic, since this is a.p. *b*, the stress would be on the first post-stem syllable in all forms, which would yield a new falling tone in all forms after the contraction. In this case, Ivšić’s law could easily explain the root stress of a.p. *b* def. forms, while the final stress of the def. a.p. *c* forms could be explained as due to the existence of both the new circumflex and new neo-acute in the endings in post-contraction times (see below), which would be an obstacle for the consistent retraction of the accent (since the neo-acute does not retract, unlike the neo-circumflex, – the latter could remain on the ending by analogy to the former). However, the problem is that def. a.p. *b* forms have root stress even in East Slavic, where there was no contraction.
As already said, the a.p. B group of adjectives is quite small in those Western Štok. dialects that still preserve a distinct a.p. C. Beside the adjectives with def. forms only (like ȍpćī ‘general’) and participles like vrũć ‘hot’, the a.p. B group is made-up practically only of long vowel (i.e. a.p. B:) adjectives meaning color (like cȉn ‘black’). The reason for this is that in Štok. (and Čak.) almost all old short vowel a.p. b adjectives have shifted to a.p. A, as we have seen: thus, nȍv – nȍva – nȍvo = čȉst – čȉsta – čȉsto. These adjectives can again shift to a.p. B but together with the original a.p. a adjectives, nȍv – nȍva – nȍvo = čȉst – čȉsta – čȉsto. The motivation for this was obviously the same accent in nom. sg. m. (nȍv = čȉst < *nȍvъ, *čȉstъ, however see above for Križanić) as well as the same accent in the def. forms (nȍvī = čȉstiī < *nȍvъjъ, *čȉstiъjъ) – this seems to be an old development. The only short vowel a.p. b monosyllabic adj. that has avoided the shift to a.p. A gȍ(ł), which is regularly a.p. B in Štok. (gòla, gòlo), similarly to the semantically close bȍs ‘barefoot’ which is the only monosyllabic short vowel a.p. C adj. (in -an adjectives, the word bolan ‘painful’ represents such an exception). The adj. zȁo ‘evil’ has remained in a.p. B as well, but

---

75 As already mentioned, the length is due to the process gȍl > *gȍo (vocalization of final -l) > gȍ (contraction) > gȍl (analogical reintroduction of final -l in some dialects). The older form / accent gȍl (beside the younger variant gô) is preserved in the dialect of Vidonje in Neretvanska Krajina (Vidović 2009, 292).

76 Such examples can also be a.p. A synchronically if one looks at adjectives alone but other forms can point to a.p. B (cf. poòpćiti ‘generalize’).

77 Cf. in Dubrovnik: gô – gòla – gòlo but bôs – bòsa – bôso (Rešetar 1900, 113).
here the shift to a.p. A was not possible because of the specific stem type that has mobile a (i.e. the reflex of the yer), which is the reason why this adjective preserves end stress (zlâ, zlô) even in Neo-Štokavian. Of course, in the dialects where the original a.p. C adjectives have shifted to a.p. B (and a.p. C is no more), a.p. B is much larger (there, one finds adjectives like mlâd – mláda – mládo ‘young’ and bôs – bôsa – bôso in a.p. B). The preservation of a.p. C is typical for the Western Štokavian dialects (this is an isogloss connecting Western Štokavian to Čakavian), while a.p. C is not present in the Eastern Štokavian dialects.

In a.p. B def. forms, one usually finds “/ “ (i.e. “/ “ in Neo-Štok.). However, in short vowel adj. the secondary ` also appears, for instance the innovative gòlî instead of the older gòlî (as already said, gol is the only monosyllabic adjective in a.p. B, but a.p. B appears in adjectives with other suffixes as well and the original def. pattern is the same there). This is a case of a mixture with the old a.p. C forms and / or the influence of indef. forms. Since the original desinential stress in a.p. C is quite rare (bôsî being the only real short vowel monosyllabic adjective and the type drâgî ‘dear’ being frequently lost), it is much more probable that secondary forms like the def. gòlâ – gòlî instead of the older gòlî – gòlî are due to analogy to the indef. forms gòla – gòlo and not to analogy to original a.p. C forms like bôsâ – bôsö or drâgà – drâgö. See above for a similar problem with the secondary accent of a.p. A def. forms.


---

78 The circumflex in gòl is due to the pre-resonant lengthening (from the older *gôl).

(suffixless) adjectives is absent, with all adjectives shifting to a.p. C (cf. there cřn – cřna – cřno).

My data from Posavina (from the villages of Sikerevci, Orubica, Kobaš, Babina Greda, Slobodnica, Budrovci) show the following for a.p. B. As in Ivšić’s description, the adjectives meaning colors – bîl, cřn, plâv, žût – are a.p. B everywhere. In the same semantic group, there is also sîv in Orubica, Kobaš, Budrovci and Slobodnica (cf. also Kostrč above) but sîv (C:) in Sikerevci and Babina Greda80 (in Babina Greda, Budrovci and Slobodnica, sîd ‘grey-haired’ remains in a.p. C: as well). An a.p. C > B shift is seen in vrãn as well (attested as B in Sikerevci and Babina Greda, cf. a.p. B in Neretvanska krajina and Kostrč). The adj. blîd has also shifted to a.p. B: in all dialects in Posavina81 (the same in Ivšić and Baotić, as well as in Imotska and Vrgorska krajina and Dubrovnik but not in Neretvanska krajina). This is a case of a Štokavian innovation (cf. Czech bledý for the original a.p. c), the same as jãk (in Sikerevci and Budrovci, the same in Ivšić, B also in Vrgorska krajina and Dubrovnik but not in Kostrč and Neretvanska krajina), cf. Czech jaký for the original a.p. c. Such a Štokavian innovation is seen in the adj. cil as well (I have cîlo attested for Orubica,82 cf. Czech celý for the original a.p. c) – in Posavina, the problem is that today mostly just the def. form cîlî is used. In Sikerevci and Kobaš, an a.p. C > B shift is seen in the adj. blâg ‘mild’ (cf. also B in Prapatnice below but Czech blahý for the original a.p. c). For paradigmatic shifts in adjectives in general, see below. The short vowel stem gôle remains a.p. B everywhere in Posavina and vrȗć has shifted to a.p. C in all mentioned dialects in my data, which is in accord with Baotić’s data but not with Ivšić’s. As in Kostrč, the adj. mâl is a.p. B: in all mentioned dialects (the original a.p. A is seen in the adverb mâlo). The neo-acute in the indef. form is taken from the frequent def. form mâlî – secondary forms mâlã / mâla and mâlô / mâlo (B) are results of analogy to mâl.

80 Originally a.p. a (see below). A.p. C: is due to analogy to the form sîv, which is the expected reflex of *sîvъ with a pre-resonant lengthening. The form sîv (B:) is due to analogy to other adjectives meaning colors.
81 The adj. gînîl can also be a.p. B: in Posavina (thus in Slobodnica and Budrovci for instance). Cf. also a.p. B: in Prapatnice as well.
82 It is interesting that the def. form cîlî is common in Neo-Štokavian Slavonia, with the accent probably due to analogy to the a.p. B indef. form.
In Prapatnice (Vrgorska krajina, my data), a.p. B: is found in the usual adjectives: cȓn (gen. sg. cȓna, dat. sg. cȓnu) – cȓn – cȓno – nom. pl. m. cȓni – def. cȓnī, the same in bija (bȉla – bȉlo) ‘white’, rîd, sîd, sîv, vrȗć (gen. sg. vrȗća – nom. sg. f. vrȗća – nom. sg. n. vrȗćo), žȗt. The adj. cȉl (gen. sg. cȉla, dat. sg. cȉlu) is also in a.p. B, as well as the short vowel adj. gȏ (gen. sg. gȍla) – gȍla – gȍlo – nom. pl. m. gômli – def. gȍlō (gen. sg. m. gȍlōga). Other adjectives that belong to this a.p. are blȗd (cf. Posavina blȗd), blȗg, gȗl, jȃk (cf. the adverb jȃko), mlȗd (with traces of the original a.p. C, see below), mlȃk, vlȃš (vlȃša – vlȃšo) ‘soft’ (cf. a.p. B: for this adjective in Imotska krajina as well). As we see, a.p. B mainly consists of adjectives meaning color (but not of vrȃn, which is C). Besides these adjectives, pȗn, vrija ‘hot’ and zrija ‘ripe’ shift to a.p. B from a.p. A and adjectives like blȗd, blȗg, jȃk, etc. are also in a.p. B, as usual in (at least some) Štok. dialects (see the a.p. C list below). All of these adjectives are in opposition to the preserved a.p. C pattern one finds in cases like nom. pl. m. bȗzi ‘quick’, čvȑstī ‘hard’, drȃgi ‘dear’, glȗvi ‘deaf’, sûvi ‘dry’, etc. (see below).


In Vidonje and Dobranje in Neretvanska krajina, a.p. B, among other adjectives, includes: bȗjēl, cȓn, sȗv, žȗt, cȉo / cȉjēl (but a.p. C when used with the word vino ‘wine’), sȗjēd, vrȗć, vrȗn, bȗz, čvȑst (the last three secondarily), while blȗjēd, blȗg, fȗjēn, sȃm, gȗl / gȍ / gȗl, jȃk, gȗlī are in a.p. C.

---

83 Cf. the adverb jȃko in Dubrovnik as well (Rešetar 1900, 135).
84 Interesting correspondences like these are just hinted at here. There has been no accentological dialect geography research in Croatia.
85 Domagoj Vidović (p.c.).

In Molise (Piccoli, Sammartino 2000), the only remnant of a.p. B is the adverb vrūčo, while all other a.p. b adj. shift to a.p. C: gȍl (gòjȃ) – góla (gen. sg. m. gȍla, f. góle), cȓn – cȓna – cȓno (the same in žȗt). The adj. sȋv has generalized ~ in all forms. The complete disappearance of a.p. B is the result of the same tendency that is often seen in Čakavian.

All indef. oblique forms (both old preserved PSl. indef. forms and new ones with def. endings, see below) have the rising accent (end stress in Old Štok.), while def. forms have the stem stress: indef. dat. sg. f. žȗtȜ – def. dat. sg. f. žȗtȜ, indef. instr. sg. m/n. žȗtȜm – def. instr. sg. m/n. žȗtȜm, etc. The original opposition of the indef. gen. sg. m/n. žȗta – def. gen. sg. m/n. žȗtȜ(g) can be replaced by the innovative indef. gen. sg. m/n. žȗtȜ(g) – def. gen. sg. m/n. žȗtȜ(g). More on this below in the a.p. C part.

Ča k a v i a n (gȍl – Senj, bĩl – Vrgada)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short vowel</th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gȍl</td>
<td>golȁ</td>
<td>golȍ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long vowel</th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bĩ(l)</td>
<td>bīlȁ</td>
<td>bīlȍ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning the suffixless monosyllabic adjectives, a.p. B is far worse preserved in Čakavian than in Štokavian. In all Čakavian dialects, at least some of the original a.p. b adjectives shift to a.p. C and, in some of the

---

86 Cf. def. žȗti with a typical Molisean shortening in gen. sg. žȗtọga. Cf. also sȋvi – gen. sg. sȋvoga.
87 Mогuš 1966, 77.
89 Instead of the expected *gȍli by analogy to gȍl, where the neo-acute is due to pre-resonant lengthening, and by analogy to other (long vowel) adjectives.
dialects, this occurs in all or almost all of the adjectives. On the other hand, most Čak. dialects preserve at least a few adjectives of the original a.p. B. The shift to a.p. C is not strange since the number of a.p. C adjectives was much greater to begin with.

One should also note that in Čak., unlike Neo-Štok., žūt is usually different from drāg, but this does not obstruct the a.p. B: > C: shift. The pivotal point for the B > C shift is probably constituted by feminine forms like žūtā = drāgā, as well as by the def. forms where the original a.p. b pattern was generalized in Čak. (žūtī = drāgī). As in Štokavian, gol is an exception since it maintains its a.p. B in some dialects, unlike all other short vowel suffixless a.p. b adjectives, which have merged with the original a.p. a adjectives (see above).⁹⁰


Cf. the Brač forms (Šimunović 2009, 44): žūt, vrūc, bīl (def. bīli), črēn, sīv (all a.p. C) but gōl – golā – golō (def. gōli) and, of course, zōl (zlā, zlō) remaining in a.p. B.


The case of the dialect of Okruk on the island of Čiovo⁹² is very interesting. In this dialect, the distinction of the old a.p. B: and a.p. C: is

---

⁹⁰ That the adj. gol is a special case in Čak. as well is seen even in cases where a.p. B is not preserved, because then gol shifts to a.p. C (like all other a.p. b adjectives in Čak.), i.e. it does not merge with the old a.p. a like nov and the other old short vowel suffixless a.p. b adjectives.

⁹¹ The adj. sijed is originally a.p. c (see below) but we list it here since it is often a.p. B: in Štokavian.

⁹² Data by Ante Jurič.
well preserved, as in some Western Štok. dialects, but the influence of a.p. C is present nevertheless. Cf. for a.p. B the pattern \( bîl – bîla – bîlo \) (< *bîlȁ, *bîlò by a regular phonetic retraction) and the same for \( žȗt, cȗn, vrȗć, sȗv, sȗd \) and \( lȗp \) (which shifted to B from the old C). Opposed to this pattern, we see the a.p. C pattern in adjectives like \( drȃg – drȃga \) (< *drāgȁ) – \( drȃgo \) (the same in \( mlȃd, blȋd, jȗt \), etc.). The distinction is preserved in neuter forms only, but it is nonetheless stable. The circumflex in the nom. sg. m. is apparently the result of the influence of a.p. C,\(^{93}\) present here, as elsewhere in Čakavian, but in Okruk only nom. sg. m. form merged with a.p. C, while neuter forms (and thus the whole pattern) remained distinct. This is a unique case in our Čak. data presented here. This preservation of a.p. B: can be seen as an isogloss connecting this dialect with Western Štok., and the same goes for the fact that the adj. \( sȗv \) and \( sȗd \) belong to a.p. B:, which is also a typical Štok. feature. This is just one of the instances pointing to a Štok.-Čak. dialectal continuum.

In the dialect of Filipjakov,\(^{94}\) a.p. B: is completely gone. Cf. \( bîl – bîla – bîlo \) (ˇ is generalized in a.p. C as well, see below), the same in \( cȗn, žȗt \) (and \( sȗd \)). Even the adj. \( gȗl \) has shifted to a.p. C: \( gȗl / gȏja – gȗla / gȗlȃ – gȗlo \) (the latter by analogy to \( bȇs \), see below, and by generalization of length).

In Preko on the island of Ugljan,\(^{95}\) all adjectives have shifted to a.p. C as in the near-by Filipjakov: \( bȉl – bȉla – bȉlo \), the same in \( vrȗć, žȗt \) (and \( sjȗd; \) in \( cȗn – cȗna – cȗno \) the syllabic \( r \) is shortened). Cf. also \( guȏ – gȗla – gȗlo \) (by analogy to \( bȗs \), see below).

On Rab (Kušar 1894, 33–34), the adj. \( bѐl, vrȗć, žȗt \) (and \( sѐd \)) are in a.p. C, but \( gȗl – gȗlȃ – gȗlȗ – pl. gȗlȗ – gȗlȅ \) remains in a.p. B (\( bȇs \) has shifted to a.p. B by analogy, but in the def. form we have \( gȗlȋ \) by analogy to the old def. form \( bȇs \)).

In Senj (Moguš 1966), \( bѐl, vrȗć, žȗt \) (and \( sȗv \)) are in a.p. C, but \( gȗl \) and \( cȗn \) remain a.p. B.

In Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 106), cf. the preservation of a.p. B in \( gȗl – gȗlȃ – gȗlȍ \) (gen. sg. m. \( gȗlȃ \) as opposed to \( bȇs – bosȁ – bȇso \)

\(^{93}\) It is important to note that the dialect preserves the distinction of the neo-acute and circumflex perfectly in all positions.

\(^{94}\) Data by Nikola Vuletić.

\(^{95}\) The forms recorded by Nikola Vuletić.

A.p. B is attested by bēl – bēl̄o (def. bēli) in Novi Vinodolski (Беличь 1909, 185), for Orlec (Houtzagers 1985, 120–121) cf. bel̄o (def. bēli), slȃn – slan̄a – slan̄a (def. slan̄i), gōl (f. and n. are not attested), and in Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998, 145) gûl̄ – gol̄a – gol̄o (B) but bîl, črn, žȗt with a shift to a.p. C.

In Rijeka (Strohal 1895, 157–158), a.p. B is attested in the type zȗt – zȗt̄a – zȗt̄a – def. zȗti. Here, one finds the adj. bēl as well but also many old a.p. c adjectives (sȗh, glȗh, l̄ep, l̄en ‘lazy’, etc.), which is strange in Čak. The indef. gen. sg. m/n. zȗt̄a has the alternative form zȗteḡa (cf. the def. gen. sg. m/n. zȗtega), while the indef. dat. sg. m/n. zȗt̄a has the variant zȗtemu (cf. the def. gen. sg. m/n. zȗtemu). The end-stressed -oḡa / -eḡa and -om̄u / -em̄u are found (in a.p. B and C) in Grobnik as well. See below for the discussion of these forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KAJKAVIAN (gōl – Velika Rakovica,96 žȗt – Prigorje)97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>short vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gōl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>žȗt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hegemony of a.p. C is typical for Kajkavian as well, even more radically than in Čakavian.98 In most of modern Kajk. dialects, a.p. B is

---

96 March 1981, 265.
97 Rožić 1893–1894 2, 144.
98 Generally speaking, the East (Eastern Štok.) is prone to a.p. B, while the West (Western Štok., Čak., Kajk.) is prone to a.p. C, with Western Štok. being more moderate and Kajk. and Čak. more ‘a.p. C radical’ since they are spoken farther to the west.
completely missing. A special reflex of a.p. B: is found only in Rožić’s Prigorje dialect and the old A/B/C distinction is preserved in Križanić’s language. One other characteristic of Kajkavian is the fact that, at least in part of it, there is no merger of the old a.p. a and the old short vowel a.p. b. This is an isogloss that connects (a part of) Kajkavian with Slovene and distinguishes it from Štokavian / Čakavian. More Kajkavian data is needed.

As already said, a.p. B is preserved in Rožić’s (1983–1984 2, 143–144) description of the dialect of Prigorje. A.p. B is seen in long vowel adjectives like žȗt – žúta – n. žúti, cf. the same pattern in bȅl, čȑn, as well as in plȁv, sȅd, sȗv99 (with these three adj. in a.p. B, just like in Štokavian), while in vrȗć – vrȗča – vrȗće / vrȗće one finds a variant shift to a.p. C. As for the old a.p. c, some of the adjectives have completely shifted to a.p. B, svȇt – svȅta – n. svȅti, while others vacillate, like sȗv – sȗva – sȗvo / sȗvo (B:/C:). But, not taking into account the adj. vrȗć and the color adjectives, the vacillation is present in the original a.p. c only, while the original a.p. b adjectives have only ´ in the neuter gender. Curiously, the adj. gȏl has shifted to a.p. A (gȏla – gȏlo) in Prigorje.


In V. Rakovica (March 1981, 265), all adjectives have shifted to a.p. C’: gȍl, prȇst, lȍś; vrȗć, žȗt, čȑn (cf. also plȁv, sȗv). The same is in Bednja (Jedvaj 1956, 305) – cf. long stem adjectives čȇrn,100 biel, žѫut, vrȇuč and short stem ones gȏel ‘naked’, nȏv ‘new’101 (def. forms with the neo-acute).

99 Mistakenly written as sȗv in the article.
100 Written as čȅrn in the article, probably by mistake.
101 It is interesting that these forms have “ (and not ”) in nom. sg. m. (thus, it is the real a.p. C and not a.p. C’). This is probably analogical to long stems (that have merged with short stems elsewhere in Bednja as well) and perhaps the def. forms.
As to the old short vowel a.p. \(b\), the adjectives from Bednja are too few (only two – although they do point to different outcomes of the old a.p. \(a\) and the old short vowel a.p. \(b\)). As for V. Rakovica, the data shows the following. The original a.p. \(a\) adjectives (joined by \(n\)\(ö\)v, see above) yield a.p. A, while the old short vowel a.p. \(b\) reflects as a.p. \(C'\) (i.e. a.p. \(C\) with no \(\tilde{\text{n}}\) in nom. sg. m.). Despite the fact that there are only three a.p. \(C'\) adjectives derived from the original short vowel a.p. \(b\), it is clear that there was no merger of the old short vowel a.p. \(b\) and the old a.p. \(a\) here (with the V. Rakovica a.p. \(C'\) being a result of the older unchanged short vowel a.p. \(B\)),\(^{102}\) unlike in Štok/Čak. where the two groups merge into a.p. A (or the reflex of it).

In Varaždin (Lip1j in 2002), one finds the def. forms only: \(b\)\(ě\)li, \(č\)\(ě\)ni, \(ž\)\(ě\)ti, \(s\)\(ě\)vi and \(g\)\(ě\)li (with a secondary \(\phi\)), which show the typical Kajkavian \(\tilde{\text{n}}\) in the original short vowel stems as well (Ivšić 1936, 72).\(^{103}\) Cf. also \(n\)\(ö\)vi, \(p\)\(r\)\(ě\)st\(i\), \(n\)\(ö\)ri. These forms, together with those from V. Rakovica, confirm that at least in part of Kajk. the old short vowel a.p. \(b\) did not merge with the old a.p. \(a\), unlike in Štok/Čak.

Križanić’s language preserves the old A/B/C distinction in short vowel stems: \(m\)\(á\)l – \(m\)\(á\)la – \(m\)\(á\)lo (A), \(G\)\(ö\)l – gen. sg. \(z\)\(ь\) \(g\)\(ö\)l\(а\) – nom. pl. \(G\)\(ö\)l\(y\), etc. (B), \(B\)\(ö\)s – nom. pl. \(b\)\(ö\)s\(i\) (C). However, the distinction is gone in the def. forms in a typically Kajkavian manner: \(m\)\(à\)li, \(G\)\(ö\)l\(ь\), \(B\)\(ö\)s\(ь\) (there is no distinction of \(\tilde{\text{n}}\) and \(\tilde{\text{~}}\) in Križanić’s texts). Cf. Očlon 2011, 110 for the def. form. In long vowel stems, the distinction between B: and C: is in recession, as it seems, although data is scarce for B:. Cf. \(s\)\(v\)ě\(t\) – \(s\)\(v\)ē\(t\)\(à\) – \(s\)\(v\)ě\(t\)o for C:, while the originally a.p. \(b\) adjectives \(Č\)\(ě\)r\(n\) – \(c\)\(z\)\(è\)r\(n\)\(o\) / \(cz\)\(è\)r\(n\)o and \(B\)\(û\)l – \(b\)\(è\)l\(à\) – \(b\)\(è\)l\(ō\) / \(b\)\(è\)l\(o\) (should be *\(b\)\(è\)l\(o\)) – nom. pl. \(b\)\(j\)\(ě\)li apparently show a vacillating B/C paradigm. Križanić’s data obviously attests the beginning of the general tendency of a B: > C: shift in Kajkavian.

Cf. Slovene:

\[b\]\(è\)l – \(b\)\(è\)la – \(b\)\(è\)l\(o\) / \(b\)\(è\)lo (def. \(b\)\(è\)li / \(b\)\(è\)li)

\(^{102}\) Had the adjectives \(g\)\(ö\)l, \(p\)\(r\)\(ö\)st, \(l\)\(ö\)š (\(b\)) already merged with old a.p. \(a\) adjectives like \(s\)\(i\)\(r\), it would not have been possible for them to shift to a.p. \(C'\) secondarily, with the old a.p. \(a\) adjectives remaining in a.p. A.

\(^{103}\) For a discussion on the phonetic development of Proto-Slavic \(*\tilde{\text{~}}* > \text{Kajkavian} \(\tilde{\text{~}}\), see Kapović (forthcoming).
In Slovene, a.p. B is preserved in both short (like nȍv) and long vowel stems, but there is a variant a.p. C form in the neuter gender, while in def. forms a neo-circumflex can appear by analogy to a.p. A.

a.p. B: běl’ white, cĕn’ black, gol’ naked, jedĕnī only, lĕvī left, mŏgūc’ (and m’ogūc) possible, ’opět general, plăv’ blue (PSl. c)\(^{104}\) sĕn’ (marine) blue (PSl. a),\(^{105}\) siv’ grey (also C: < A,\(^{106}\) PSl. a),\(^{107}\) vruč’ hot (> C:), zal’\(^{108}\) evil, žūt’ yellow

Three most frequent Proto-Slavic long vowel a.p. b adjectives were color terms –*bělъ, *čьrnъ and *žьltъ. This is preserved in Croatian and has influenced other adjectives denoting color to shift to a.p. B:, since a.p. B: has become a salient marker of the adjectives used for color terms.\(^{109}\) Thus, *sǐnъ and *sivъ shift to a.p. B: from a.p. a, while *blĕdъ, *sĕdъ and *pŏlvъ shift to a.p. B: from a.p. c. A.p. B: shift tendencies are not necessarily general and early (at least not in all of the adjectives),\(^{110}\) since the original a.p. is preserved in some dialects (cf. sìv, blĳedo and sído above). As part of this tendency, the adj. *vŏrnъ ‘black’ also shifted to a.p. B: in some dialects, and the adj. *mŭrkъ ‘glum’ shifted from a.p. A to a.p. B: in some dialects as well.

\(^{104}\) For the PSl. a.p. c cf. a.p. C in Zaliznyak’s data (З а л и з н я к 1985, 138) and Czech / Slovak plavý. Lithuanian has both palvás and pálvas. Snoj (in his dictionary) claims that Slovene plăv – pláva (a.p. A) is a loanword from other Slavic languages.

\(^{105}\) For the PSl. a.p. a cf. a.p. A in Zaliznyak’s data (З а л и з н я к 1985, 133) and Czech / Slovak siný.

\(^{106}\) Cf. ARj for the form sìv in Žumberak.

\(^{107}\) For PSl. *sivъ (a.p. a) cf. e.g. Slv. sȉv – síva, Czech / Slovak sivý and Lithuanian šývas.

\(^{108}\) The adj. zȁo – zlâ – zlȏ, because of its morphonological structure (mobile a, i.e. the reflex of the yer in the root) remains in a.p. B and preserves the end stress (the ending being the only syllable) even in dialects that have experienced retraction. Here, beside the expected def. form zlȋ – zlȁ – zlȏ (with end stress, like in a.p. C, but again due to the specific structure of this word) the secondary def. form zlȋ – zlȁ – zlȏ with the shortened ending is also attested in some dialects (probably by analogy to the indef. forms).

\(^{109}\) At least in Štok., for Čak. and Kajk. it is difficult to say since a.p. B in suffixless adjectives is generally moribund or marginal there (but cf. above the Prigorje data for Kajk.).

\(^{110}\) The exact territorial and dialectal extent of these changes is still to be examined in details.
3. a.p. c

PROTO-SLAVIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Vowel</th>
<th>Indefinite Adjectives</th>
<th>Definite Adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bȍsъ ‘barefoot’</td>
<td>*bosá</td>
<td>*bòso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bȍso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Vowel</th>
<th>Indefinite Adjectives</th>
<th>Definite Adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sȗxъ ‘dry’</td>
<td>*sȗxá</td>
<td>*sȗxo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sȗxo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In PSl., the indef. forms of adj. were morphologically exactly the same as nouns of o-stems (masculine and neuter) and ā-stems (feminine). The accentual pattern was the same as well. Thus, *bȍsъ and *sȗxъ have the same kind of accentual paradigm as e.g. *bȍgъ ‘god’ and *gȏrdъ ‘town’, *bosá and *sȗxá as *voda ‘water’ and *rȏka ‘arm’ (cf. e.g. acc. sg. *bȍsǫ, *sȗxǫ) and *bȍso, *sȗxo like *zvȍno ‘bell’, *zȏlto ‘gold’.

In def. adj., the stress was always on the last syllable or on the one before that. The exact position depended on the accentological properties of certain endings, i.e. on accentual valences. In i indef. adjectives, like in nouns, some forms had absolute initial stress (if the ending had (–) valence), while others had end stress (if the ending was (+)). Thus, forms like *bȍsъ, nom. sg. n. *bòso, gen. sg. m/n. *bȏsa, dat. sg. m/n. *bȍsu, dat. sg. f. *bȏsə, acc. sg. f. *bȏsǫ, etc. are stress-initial, but forms like gen. pl. *bosъ, nom. sg. f. *bosá, gen. sg. f. *bosȏ, etc. have final accentuation. Definite adjective forms are made by adding the forms of the demonstrative pronoun *jȏ, *jě, *jȅ (cf. Дыбо 1981, 36 for the reconstruction) on the indef. forms (or, later, on the stem *bosъ- / bosъ- in some cases). If an indef. form had its own ictus, i.e. if it was not unaccented (= with absolute initial stress), but had a strong (+) ending, like the forms *bosá (i.e. *bosȏ), gen. sg. f. *bosȏ, gen. pl. *bosъ, the stress remained in the same position in the complex def. form as well: *bosȏja, def. gen. sg. f. *bosȏjȏ, def. gen. pl. *bosȏjъ > *bosȏjъ, etc. But if the form was unaccented (an enclinomenon, i.e. a form with the (–) ending), the stress was on the final syllable, according to the rule of

---

111 From the older *bosȏjъ, *suxȏjъ.
Vasiľev and Dolobko (cf. *dě̊ь 'day’ but *dě̊ь̣ь > Croat. dànas ‘today’). If the second part of the complex adj. (i.e. the form of the pronoun *jь) was monosyllabic, the stress was on the last syllable, of course, e.g. def. nom. sg. m. *bosъjь, def. nom. sg. n. *bosojè. If the pronoun forms were disyllabic (in oblique cases), where they were end-stressed (gen. sg. m/n. *jegò, dat. sg. m/n. *jemù, loc. pl. *jě̊́xь, instr. pl. *jîmî), 112 the stress of the def. adj. form was also on the last syllable (i.e. on the second syllable of the second part of the complex adj. form): def. gen. sg. m/n. *bosajegò, def. dat. sg. m/n. *bosajemû, etc. In this way, for instance, the distinction of the def. acc. sg. f. *bosǫjǫ (< *bȕsǫ + *jǫ) and the def. instr. sg. f. *bosójǫ (< *bosojǫ + *(je)jǫ) was created. The whole paradigm is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sg.</th>
<th>n.</th>
<th>f.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>*bosỳjь</td>
<td>*bosojё</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>*bosajegò</td>
<td>*bosýjè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>*bosujejìmù</td>
<td>*bosojè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>*bosỳjь</td>
<td>*bosojё</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>*bosějèmь</td>
<td>*boséjì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>*bosyjìmbь</td>
<td>*bosyjìmbь</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pl.</th>
<th>n.</th>
<th>f.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>*bosìjì</td>
<td>*bosája</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>*bosýjè</td>
<td>*bosýjè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>*bosyjìmbь</td>
<td>*bosyjìmbь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>*bosyjè</td>
<td>*bosája</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>*bosyjìxъ</td>
<td>*bosyjìxъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>*bosyjìxъ</td>
<td>*bosyjìxъ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

112 For the reconstruction, cf. Дыб о 1981, 34, 36 and the oldest Štok. accent njèga, njèmu (Štok. nîjìna is secondary compared to PSl. *jîmâ).
113 As a parallel for *bȕsǫ + *jegò > *bosajegò cf. *pě́tь + (gen. pl.) *desě́t > *pě́tьdesě́t (Croat. pedesě́t > pedè́sě́t).
114 From the older *bosjì.
115 The nominative form (*bosì + *jimь) was taken instead of the expected *bosomь + *jimь. *-ь then yields *-y- in front of *-j- and the form *bosyjìmbь (OCS bosyjìmbь) appears. Cf. H a m m 1970, 140.
116 From the older *bosìjь.
117 Instead of *bosomь + *jimь. *-y- in the middle is either from the nominative form *bosì (which lengthens the ending *-ь- to *-y- in front of *-j-), by analogy to gen. pl. (where the indef. ending is also *-ь- that lengthens to *-y- in front of *-j-) or from instr. pl. (where the indef. ending is *-y-).
118 Instead of *bosěxъ + *jîxъ.
Note. In dat., loc. and instr. pl. the reconstruction is not completely clear. The accent of the def. form would differ depending on the derivation. If the stem *bosy- is to be derived from the orthotonic instr. pl. *bось (with (+) ending), this would yield the accent *bosъjмъ in the complex form as well. If *bosy- is to be derived from nom. sg. *босъ (enclinomenon), one would expect the forms: dat. pl. *bosъjмъ < *bosъjмъ, loc. pl. *bosъjъxъ > *bosъjъъxъ. These forms could have perhaps influenced the instr. pl. *bosъjмъ to become *bosъjмъ. Since these endings were contracted later in Slavic and since one would expect levellings of all sorts in these cases, it is impossible to tell what the original accent of these forms was.

It is clear that such a paradigm was quite complex as regards stress position, i.e. whether it was on the ultimate or the penultimate syllable, upon which the intonation of the contracted vowel depended. There was a tendency to generalize the stress position, e.g. *bосъje by analogy to *bосъиъ and *босъа in the older *bосъе. It is understood that this means that a part of the presented reconstructions is actually not corroborated by the later data because of different levellings – it is rather based on a structural analysis of the system.

Cf. Russian:

мольд – молодая – мольдо (def. молодой)

In Russian, a.p. C is quite well preserved and most of the root adjectives belong to it. Many of the original a.p. a (e.g. сыт) and a.p. b (e.g. гол) adjectives have secondarily shifted to a.p. C. Except for the mobile stress of the indef. forms, the end stress of the def. forms is also well preserved.

An important role in the reconstruction of PSl. adj. accentual types is played by West Slavic languages. There, the original a.p. c adjectives preserve the shortened vowel in the root, cf. Czech blahý, bledý, suchý.

---

120 Stang’s (1957, 103) reconstruction and analysis of a.p. c def. adj. accentuation is not correct. The accent type suh̥i (instead of suhī), which he wishes to explain from a Proto- or Common Slavic perspective, due to the ending contractions (which was a later phenomenon), does not have anything to do with PSl. Forms like suh̥i are much younger forms and are due to analogy to a.p. B (see below).
121 Cf. Kapović 2005a, 97–100.
The brevity appears in the reflexes of the original a.p. \( a \) as well, cf. starý, zdravý, but not in the original a.p. \( b \), where the root remains long: hloupy ‘stupid’, moudrý ‘clever’, bílý ‘white’.

**Štokavian**

**short vowel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bōs</td>
<td>bōsa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>long vowel</th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sūh</td>
<td>sūha</td>
<td>sūho (sūho)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accentuation of indef. declension of a.p. C adjectives is the same as in nouns – of course, in those cases where the original endings are preserved:

N. sūh – sūho – sūhā (cf. grȃd – zlȃto – dúša soul)

G. sūha – sūhē (cf. grȃda / zlȃta – dúšě)

D. sūhu (cf. grȃdu / zlȃtu)

A. sūh / sūha – sūho – sūhu (cf. grȃd / vȉka wolf – zlȃto – dúšu)

L. sūhu\(^{122}\) (cf. grȃdu – zlȃtu)\(^{123}\)

n. sūhi – sūha – sūhe

a. sūhe – sūha – sūhe

---

\(^{122}\) Since many dialects do not have indef. adjectival declension, the opposition of dat/loc. sg. in a.p. C (cf. Kapović 2010, 79–81) or adjectival a.p. C, it is not clear if a dialect exists in which indef. dat. sg. m/n. sūhu and indef. loc. sg. m/n. *sūhu would be different or if these forms are always the same. Looking at the data from the dialects preserving indef. adj. declension and a.p. C, it seems that indef. dat. sg. m/n. is identical to indef. loc. sg. m/n., just like in neuter and masculine animate o-stems. Cf. dat/loc. sg. sūhu in Dubrovnik (Rešetar 1900, 121), in Prapatnice (Vrgorska Krajina, my data): ť_sūvu krȗvu ‘(living) on old bread’, nȃ lȉpu mȉstu ‘in a nice place’, nȃ kȑvu mȉstu ‘in a wrong place’, in Posavina (Ivšić 1913 2, 44) ť_tȗdu sȅlu ‘in a foreign village’, nȃ lȉpu mjȅstu.

\(^{123}\) For the accentuation of neuter o-stems, cf. Kapović 2011a.
In other cases / forms, the endings were taken from the def. declension (see below for the explanation of accent in those cases):

DL. súhōj
I. súhīm – súhōm (cf. dúšōm)

g. súhīh
dli. súhīm(a)\textsuperscript{124}

The indef. a.p. C forms (as opposed to a.p. B) are preserved in Western Štokavian, for instance in Posavina and Dalmatinska Zagora (which are connected to Čak. through this isogloss). There, the a.p. C pattern (drȃg – drȃga – drȃgo – pl. drȃgi – drȃge – drȃga) stands in opposition to the a.p. B pattern (žȗt – žȗta – žȗto – pl. žȗti – žȗte – žȗta). On the other hand, in the Eastern Štok. dialects (e.g. in the East Herzegovinian dialect) a.p. C is absent and only a.p. B is found: drȃg / žȗt – drȃga / žȗta – drȃgo / žȗto – drȃgi / žȗti – drȃge / žȗte – drȃga / žȗta.\textsuperscript{125} Such a system, with a.p. B only, is, for instance, represented by the classical literary Štokavian of the Vuk-Daničić type (i.e. in classical ‘Serbo-Croatian’). In certain recent Standard Croatian handbooks however, the a.p. B : C distinction in adjectives is reintroduced based on Western tokavian dialects.\textsuperscript{126} Of course, a.p. C is not preserved everywhere in the west. There are some Western tokavian dialects where a.p. C is partially or completely gone and in some dial. the older and younger forms fluctuate and coexist. In some urban Western tok. dial., a younger generalized, apparently quite recent, a.p. B: appears instead of the older a.p. C:.

In the merger of a.p. B and a.p. C, the pivotal forms are drȃga = žȗta that have the same accent in both paradigms (the same in gen. sg. f. drȃgē / žȗtē, instr. sg. f. drȃgōm / žȗtōm, etc.). The new form drȃgo is analogical to the form drȃga. In Neo-Štok., the merger of a.p. B and C is facilitated by the merger of the neo-acute and circumflex, which yields drȃg = žȗt for

\textsuperscript{124} The same is in Dubrovnik (Rešetar 1900, 121) but with the following differences: instr. sg. m/n. súhijem, gen. pl. súhijeh, dat/loc/instr. pl. súhijem.

\textsuperscript{125} Cf. e.g. in Mostar grúbo ‘rough’, mládo ‘young’, lȗto ‘angry’ (Milaš 1903, 95–96) – however, a.p. C appears there as well sometimes.

\textsuperscript{126} For instance in ŠRHJ.
the older \( \text{dr\`{a}g} : \text{\`{z}u\`{t}} \). It is for this reason that the disappearance of a.p. B in Eastern \( \text{\`{S}t} \).k. is often related to the supposed early disappearance of the neo-acute there. However, one must bear in mind that the opposite tendency, a.p. B: > C:, is strongest in \( \text{\`{C}a} \).kavian, where the distinction of the neo-acute and circumflex is most often preserved. There, it is clear that the distinction of \( \text{dr\`{a}g} : \text{\`{z}u\`{t}} \) is not an obstacle for the merger of these two accentual types. In some dialects, the role of the younger accent of the def. forms may have had an influence. Def. forms like \( \text{dr\`{a}g\`{i}} (< \text{dr\`{a}g\`{i}}) \) have the younger accent analogical to a.p. B: – since the accent was already the same in the def. forms, there may have been a tendency to merge them in the indef. ones as well. In addition, the def. form \( \text{dr\`{a}g\`{o}} \) is much more distinct from the younger indef. form \( \text{dr\`{a}go} \) than from the older indef. form \( \text{dr\`{a}go} \), especially in dialects where posttonic length tends to disappear. It is imaginable that the rising accent was perceived as a salient marker of indefiniteness, while the falling accent became a marker of definiteness.

The only example of an a.p. C short vowel stem is the adj. \( \text{b\`{o}s} \), which in its nom. sg. m. retains the lengthening seen elsewhere in nominatives sg. of a.p. c ending in a yer, e.g. in nouns like \( \text{m\`{o}st} \) ‘bridge’ or \( \text{k\`{o}st} \) ‘bone’ \( \text{(Kapovi\v{c} 2008a, 12–13)} \). This adjective preserves the original a.p. C in many dialects (except in those where it is completely absent, of course) and it preserves the length in nom. sg. m. even if it shifts to a.p. B – thus, secondary \( \text{b\`{o}so} / \text{b\`{o}s\`{o}} \) but \( \text{b\`{o}s} \) nonetheless. Short vowel a.p. c adjectives were rare already in PSl. and in Croatian only \( \text{b\`{o}s} \) was preserved. The other case of the old a.p. c adjective with a short vowel is the adj. \( \text{k\`{o}s} \) ‘slant’, but here there were two possible results and the short a.p. C was in fact not preserved anywhere, as it seems. In some dialects, the length from nom. sg. m. form \( \text{k\`{o}s} \) was generalized yielding a.p. C: in this way: \( \text{k\`{o}s} – \text{k\`{o}sa} – \text{k\`{o}so} \) (like \( \text{dr\`{a}g} – \text{dr\`{a}ga} – \text{dr\`{a}go} \)).\(^\text{127}\) Elsewhere, this adjective shifted to a.p. A,\(^\text{128}\) like short vowel a.p. b adjectives. Thus, only \( \text{b\`{o}s} \) remained in the a.p. C group. The situation is similar in other Slavic languages as well, due to the short vowel a.p. C adjectives being rare already in PSl. In Zaliznyak’s

\(^{127}\) The length is even transferred to the related verb, thus \( \text{k\`{o}s\`{i}t} \) ‘go against, make slant’ instead of the older \( \text{k\`{o}s\`{i}t} \). For \( \text{\`{C}a} \).k., cf. \( \text{k\`{o}s}, -\text{a}, -\text{o} \) in Grobnik (L u k e \v{z} i \v{c}, Z u b \v{c} i \v{c} 2007).

\(^{128}\) The form \( \text{k\`{o}s} \) is attested in Vuk’s dictionary and ARj.
Old Russian data, a.p. C consists mainly of old long vowel stems. From originally short vowel stems, one finds only the adjectives босъ, косъ, простъ (this adj. shifted to a.p. B quite early in Štokavian, it seems), новъ and скоръ (which were originally a.p. b, cf. Croat. нȍв, skȍр) and деснъ ‘right (side)’, attested solely as definite in Croat. (дȅsnī).


In Šaptinovac (Ivšić 1907, 140), a.p. C is preserved (лȅп – lépa – лȅpo), but there is no a.p. B in root adj., i.e. all of them shifted to a.p. C (cȑn – cȑna – cȑno). The opposite happened in Southern Baranja (Sekereš 1977, 388): mlȃd – mlȃda – mlȃdo (the same in drȁg, glȗv, etc. but also vrȗć, žȗt) with a complete merger of the original a.p. b and c. This is corroborated by my data from the Baranja dialect of Batina: drȁg – drága – drágo, etc. A consistent a.p. C: pattern like drága – drágo is found in the innovative...
Posavian dialect of Brodski Stupnik\textsuperscript{134} as well (my data). A similar, but unfinished, tendency to the C: > B: shift is found in the dialect of Slobodnica, where some adjectives remain in a.p. C: (sūv, svēt, tūp, tvīrd, źīv, etc.), while in others variants like drāgo / drágo occur (thus in ĝūst, krūt, krīv, lūd, lūp, etc.) with a great deal of vacillation. Cf. the same case in Budrovci with a great deal of variation and mixed patterns: bȓz – bȑza – bȑzo – pl. bȑzi – bȑze, čvěst – čvěsta – čvěsto – pl. čvěsti – čvěste, glūv – glūva – glūvo – pl. glūvi – glūve, lűd – lűda – lűdo / lúdo – pl. lűdi – lűde, etc.

In Imotska krajina and Bekija (Šimundić 1971, 130–131), a.p. C (type līp – līpa – līpo) is well preserved in a number of adjectives. In acc. sg. f., older forms like līpu have younger variants like līpu. In mlād and blȃd, the neuter forms have the variants blīdo / blīdo (i.e. type B/C), which is in accord, as said, with a.p. B: in these adjectives in Vrgorska krajina (in blījed this is a case of a broader Štok. innovation and in mlād it is a case of a regional Imotski-Vrgorac innovation).\textsuperscript{135}


\textsuperscript{135} As opposed to Vrgorska and Imotska Krajina, mlād remains a.p. C in Neretvanska Krajina (Domagoj Vidović, p.c.).

Generalization of the falling accent, typical for some Čak. dialects, is less frequent in Štok. but not unknown, cf. in Prčanj (Rešetar 1900, 114): svēt – svēta – svēto (the same in lījep), and in some Molisean adjectives: gūst, -a, -o, sūh, -a, -o (gen. sg. sūha, -e) – def. sūhi (sūhoga, sūhe), and in krīv, -a / krīva (krīvoga, krīve / krīve) with variants.

Originally, a.p. C def. forms had end stress, which is attested in Croat. forms such as bosī and tūdī (cf. dial. bosī, tūdī with no retraction). Depending on the PSl. situation, in some cases after the contraction one would expect end stress in Croat. (as in *bosajegō > **bosōgā), in other cases long falling accent (as in *bosāja > *bosāja > bosā) because the original accent was on the first of the contracted vowels, and in some cases one would expect the neo-acute (e.g. in *bosojē > **bosô). Of course, such variations in different cases (the interchange of ~ and ˇ) would be quite complex and levellings would be expected (with either ~ or ˇbeing generalized), which is exactly what happened. Here, we give PSl. forms, the expected reflexes in Croat. and then Old Štok. forms from Kostrč (Baotić 1979, 197),137 Ivšić’s description of Posavina (Ivšić 1913 2, 42–44, 49–51)138 and from my Posavian data:

136 In examples like grūb – grūba, -o (the same in drāg, gnjīl, žīv), the supposed neuter forms (like *grūbo) may be absent and due to inadequate accent marking in the dictionary, considering the fact that a.p. B: is almost completely gone from Molise (see above).

137 Baotić gives these stressed endings in the example čistić which is a secondary member of this accentual pattern (cf. the older Kostrč version čisti) but here it makes no difference. In Ivšić 1913, there is no data for the whole def. and indef. adjectival declension.

138 Of course, one should be careful with Ivšić’s data since the specific forms are taken from different local dialects, which probably have different systems and different individual forms. It is also interesting to note that Ivšić does not give all oblique cases but that all of the ones mentioned have the neo-acute.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto-Slavic</th>
<th>expected in Croat.</th>
<th>Old Štok. (Kostrč)</th>
<th>Old Štok. (Domaljevac)</th>
<th>Old Štok. (Slobodnica)</th>
<th>Old Štok. (Posavina – Ivšić)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. *-jęł (?)</td>
<td>*-i (?)</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-oję</td>
<td>*-ō</td>
<td>-ō</td>
<td>-ō</td>
<td>-ō</td>
<td>-ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-ąja</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ą</td>
<td>-ą</td>
<td>-ą</td>
<td>-ą</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. *-ajęgo</td>
<td>*-oąa</td>
<td>-oą</td>
<td>-oą</td>
<td>-oą</td>
<td>-oą</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-ęał (?</td>
<td>*-ęał</td>
<td>*-ęał</td>
<td>*-ęał</td>
<td>*-ęał</td>
<td>*-ęał</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. *-ujęmu</td>
<td>*-ołu</td>
<td>-ołu</td>
<td>-ołu</td>
<td>-ołu</td>
<td>-ołu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-ęji</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ę</td>
<td>-ę</td>
<td>-ę</td>
<td>-ę</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. *-jęł (?)</td>
<td>*-i (?)</td>
<td>-i (-oą)</td>
<td>-oą</td>
<td>-oą</td>
<td>-oą</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-oję</td>
<td>*-ō</td>
<td>-ō</td>
<td>-ō</td>
<td>-ō</td>
<td>-ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-ąjō</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ą</td>
<td>-ą</td>
<td>-ą</td>
<td>-ą</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

139 We take soft PSI. variant for the cases in which they were later generalized in Štok.
140 My data. The forms / accents are from the declension of the adj. muški ‘male’.
141 My data.
142 Or *-jęł if the new *-y- is short (but cf. Croat. dial. *-i in gen. pl. of i-stems). If *-i is to be expected in Croatian, the analogical spread of the circumflex is more problematic.
143 The expected form would actually be *-oąa but *-ą- changed to *-ō- because of the influence of pronouns like *togo > toga, *ovogo > ovoga, *onogo > onoga, etc., while the final -a is analogical to nominal / indef. adj. ending -a. The length of the first vowel in -oąa is from the old *-ąa, where it is of contractual origin, which is supported by other cases where the vowel is also long (-oga is short in pronouns, cf. tòga).
144 In Croat., *-ęje > -ę (with the soft variant being generalized). One would expect *-ęje to indeed yield -ę but if PSI. *-ę was actually *-ę (with the final neo-acute as a reflex of BSl. circumflex), it is not clear what *-ęje would yield. One possibility is that the neo-acute of the first syllable would prevail and the other is that the end result might still be a falling accent because the original stress was on the first (and not the second) syllable.
145 Cf. -ę in indef. adjectives (= nouns).
146 Ivšić only gives indef. bosę, where this form is expected, like in the nominal gen. sg. vodę.
147 With analogical vocalism, like in gen. sg.
148 The dat/loc. sg. f. ending -ōj is due to analogy to loc. sg. m/n. -ōm (and also dat. sg. -ōmu), i.e. the vowel *-o- is due to that influence (the ending -ōm(u) in m/n. is, on the other hand, due to pronominal endings). The old endings *-ęj / *-i is could not yield the ending -ōj regularly. The length, i.e. the neo-acute in *-ęj > *-ōj has the same origin as instr. sg. of ā-stems (where *-oję > *-oũ > *-ōv (→ *-ōm)).
149 Ivšić gives this form in the indef. declension but, since this ending is originally a def. one taken into indef. declension, the form is relevant for the def. declension as well.
Historical development of adjective accentuation in Croatian...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L. *-ćjemь</th>
<th>*-om(^{150})</th>
<th>*-om</th>
<th>*-oj</th>
<th>*-om(^{151})</th>
<th>*-oj</th>
<th>*-om(^{154})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>*-yjimь</td>
<td>*im</td>
<td>*-im/-im</td>
<td>*-im</td>
<td>*-im</td>
<td>*-im</td>
<td>*-im</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*-ôj</td>
<td>*-om(^{152})</td>
<td>-ôj</td>
<td>-ôm</td>
<td>-ôm</td>
<td>-ôm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*-ôm</td>
<td>*-om</td>
<td>-ôm</td>
<td>-ôm</td>
<td>-ôm</td>
<td>-ôm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*-ôj</td>
<td>-ôj</td>
<td>-ôj</td>
<td>-ôj</td>
<td>-ôj</td>
<td>-ôj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*-ôm(^{153})</td>
<td>-ôm</td>
<td>-ôm</td>
<td>-ôm</td>
<td>-ôm</td>
<td>-ôm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>*-i</td>
<td>*-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*-a</td>
<td>*-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*-ê</td>
<td>*-ê</td>
<td>-ê</td>
<td>-ê</td>
<td>-ê</td>
<td>-ê</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>*-yjь</td>
<td>*-i</td>
<td>*-i/-i</td>
<td>*-i</td>
<td>*-i/-i (?)</td>
<td>*-i/-i (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>*-yjimь</td>
<td>*-im</td>
<td>*-im</td>
<td>*-im (loc.)</td>
<td>*-im (loc.)</td>
<td>*-im (loc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*-im</td>
<td>*-im</td>
<td>*-im</td>
<td>*-im</td>
<td>*-im</td>
<td>*-im</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>*-ê</td>
<td>*-ê</td>
<td>-ê</td>
<td>-ê</td>
<td>-ê</td>
<td>-ê</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*-a</td>
<td>*-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*-ê</td>
<td>*-ê</td>
<td>-ê</td>
<td>-ê</td>
<td>-ê</td>
<td>-ê</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>*-yjixь</td>
<td>*-ih</td>
<td>*-ih</td>
<td>*-ih</td>
<td>*-ih</td>
<td>*-ih</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*-ih</td>
<td>*-ih</td>
<td>*-ih</td>
<td>*-ih</td>
<td>*-ih</td>
<td>*-ih</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>*-yjimi</td>
<td>*-imi</td>
<td>*-imi</td>
<td>*-imi</td>
<td>*-imi</td>
<td>*-imi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Čak., at least in some dialects (see below), ̈ is generalized in all cases. In Štok., one finds a vacillation between ̈ and ̇, the exact pattern depending on the dialect (although more data is needed). In Bosnian Posavina,\(^{155}\) most cases have ̈, but ̇ also appears, and in Ivšić’s Posavian data one finds even more neo-acute accents in the paradigm.\(^{156}\) The following changes occurred\(^{157}\) if we compare the attested forms with what is expected:

\(^{150}\) Vocalism by analogy to *tomь.

\(^{151}\) Again, these forms are given by Ivšić as indef. (the def. form would have the accent mrřtv-) but since these endings are originally from the def. declension, we take them to be relevant here (albeit with a caveat).

\(^{152}\) Older *-ôv, like in instr. sg. of ā-stems.

\(^{153}\) The same in indef. declension. Cf. from čista (indef., secondary a.p. C) also čistôm / ĉistôm. This is especially interesting when compared to only -ôm (e.g. vodôm) in instr. sg. of ā-stem nouns. In indef. instr. sg. f. this is, then, due to analogy to def. forms, while in instr. sg. m/n. the ending is originally from the def. declension in any case.

\(^{154}\) Ivšić only has indef. instr. sg. f. bosôm, mrtvôm ‘dead’.

\(^{155}\) Kostrč and Domaljevac are villages in Bosnian Posavina, relatively close to each other. My data from Domaljevac are in accord with Baotić’s from Kostrč, except for the fact that in mine there are no variants in instr. sg. and dat. pl., which may be just a coincidence (Baotić described his native dialect so he knew all possible variants, of course).

\(^{156}\) In my data from the village of Slobodnica in the Croatian part of Posavina, the neo-acute is not so frequent. This can either be an old dialectal difference from Ivšić’s data or an innovation in the last one hundred years since Ivšić’s research.

\(^{157}\) A role may have been played by pronominal accent (cf. I všiĉ 1913 2, 37–38). For instance, the pronoun tȃj can have both ̈ and ̇ in oblique cases in Posavina.
NOM. SG. -ȕ (n.) by analogy to -ȃ (-i is either original or analogical to -ȃ).

GEN. SG. the form -ȃg is obviously younger than Ivšić’s -ȃg (the neo-acute is expected in the truncated form derived from the expected *-ȃgȃ) and made by analogy to other cases where the falling tone is expected; -ȅ (f.) is expected (cf. -ȅ in gen. sg. of indef. adj. / ā-stem nouns)

DAT. SG. the form -ȃmu has the position of stress by analogy to other cases, and ~ in -ȃj (f.) is also analogical – Ivšić’s -ȃj is expected here

ACC. SG. the accent -ȗ (f.) is analogical

LOC. SG. Ivšić has the expected -ȃm / -ȃj; the forms -ȃm / -ȃj have the accent by analogy to other cases with ~

INSTR. SG. the expected -*(61,498),(157,517)(63,515),(158,533)m (m/n.), -*(61,498),(157,517)m (f.) yields Baotić’s variant ~*/~ in both forms

NOM. PL. ~ is taken to n. and f. form by analogy to other cases

GEN. PL. in Posavina, both the expected ~ and ~ are found – this could be due to loc. pl. -ȋ(h) (if this is to be expected here)¹⁵⁸ or by analogy to pronominal forms (cf. Posavian ķȋ beside ķȋ¹⁵⁹ < PSl. *jȋxъ)¹⁶⁰

DAT. PL. both ~ and ~ appear and the reconstruction is not clear

ACC. PL. as in nom. pl.

LOC. PL. as in dat. pl.

In Posavina, it is remarkable that the accentuation in the endings has not been levelled (it still has both ~ and ~). Of course, the distribution of circumflex / neo-acute is different from what one would expect from PSl. if there have been no analogical developments. The situation varies across dialects, as we have seen.

The original desinential stress of the def. a.p. C forms is nowhere consistently preserved in tokavian. In short vowel root adjectives, the end stress can be preserved in bòsī (which can otherwise change to a younger bȍsī). On the other hand, such an accent appears secondarily also in čistī (instead of čȉstī, originally a.p. A) or in gòlī (instead of gȍlī, originally a.p. B). Sometimes both younger and older forms coexist. In long vowel root adjectives, the end stress presumes a shortened root vowel (svètī) as

¹⁵⁸ Especially in Posavina, where the final -h is lost and gen. and dat. pl. merge.
¹⁵⁹ I v š i ć 1913 2, 36.
¹⁶⁰ One should also bear in mind that the neo-acute is a sort of a marker of gen. pl. (cf. for instance -ȋ in i-stems).
opposed to the preserved length in indef. forms (svêt – svéta – světo, if not levelled to svéto). Due to a tendency to generalize length in def. forms as well, they shift from C to B: type. Thus, one gets světī > světī instead of the older světī, which means that the quantitative alternation is lost.\footnote{Theoretically, forms like **světī could have come about but it seems that this did not happen anywhere in regular adjectives (however, cf. the type vrážjī with a secondary length in the Eastern Štok. dialects instead of the original vràžjī with a shortened root in the West).} For the preservation of a.p. C def. end stress, see below.

The younger accent of the světī / světī type is generalized in some dialects in all (or almost all) adjectives, while other dialects preserve the original pattern in some examples. Most of dialects (the standard language included) preserve the original accent in the adj. tūđī ‘foreign’ because here the indef. forms (tūđ – tūđa – tūđe / tūđe) are usually not used anymore in most dialects and there is thus no tendency to generalize the length. There is no connection between the preservation of the old a.p. C in indef. forms and the preservation of the old a.p. C pattern in def. forms. For instance, in some dialects in Dalmatinska Zagora, the indef. a.p. C type is well preserved, while the C type in def. forms is preserved in certain adjectives but not nearly as well as in indef. forms. In Posavina, however, a.p. C indef. forms are very well preserved, but the type C is rarely preserved in def. forms (except, curiously, secondarily in the old a.p. B and C). And, of course, there is the case of Čak., where a.p. C has a hegemony in indef. stems, while the type C is, for instance, practically absent from long vowel suffixless def. adjectives (unlike Štok.). It is interesting that the type C accent (i.e. end stress) is preserved in many dialects almost only in secondary forms, e.g. in the original a.p. A, etc., while it is not present in a.p. C (or in original a.p. C adjectives).

In the contemporary standard language, in the long vowel a.p. C suffixless adj., only the drāgī type is present (except for the adj. tūđī).\footnote{Daničić (1872, 91–92, 94, Даничић 1925, 213, 215) gives the following examples for literary Štokavian: čèstī / čȇstī frequent, svètī / svȇtī, krūpnī / krūpnī large, žītkī / žītkī viscous, kràtkī / krȃtkī short, rȅtkī / rȉjetkī rare, strȁšnī / strȃšnī terrifying, tȅškī (next to the secondary tȅškī – the usual form being tȇškī), etc. Leskien (1914, 386f) gives for the literary language: čèstī / čȇstī, glȗhī / glȗhī, gnjȗlī / gnjȗlī, guštī / guštī, ljȗtī / ljȗtī, rȉdī / rȉdī, sȇń̆ī / sȇń̆ī, sȗhī / sȗhī, svètī / svȇtī, tȗđī / tȗđī, tvȇdī / tvȇdī,
However, in dialects the *drāgī* type is preserved in various adjectives and to various extent. This type has also secondarily spread to the original a.p. *a* and a.p. *b* adjectives. Here, we shall give some examples (not only for root adjectives): in Šaptinovac (Ivšić 1907, 142) only *suvī* and *lutī*, in Posavina in general (Ivšić 1913 2, 49–50): *tuđī, mlāđī*, rarely *strašnī*\(^{163}\) *lādnī, tēškī*, in Dubrovnik: *glādnī, glūhī, ļutī, plītīkī, slānī, sūhī, tūdī, prāznī* (originally a.p. *b*, \(+\)tvīdī, tēškī and secondarily *vrūčī* (Budmani 1883, 173; Rešetar 1900, 129),\(^{164}\) in Imotski and Bekija (Šimundić 1971, 137, 139): *krùpnī* (originally a.p. *b*), tēškī (and secondarily in many short vowel adj.). In Neretvanska krajina (Vidović 2007, 203; 2009, 289): *gūstī* ‘dense’, *rjētkī, tēškī, tjēsnī* ‘narrow’ (a.p. *c*) and *rūžnī* ‘ugly’, *krùpnī, prāznī, rāvnī* ‘straight’ (a.p. *b*).\(^{165}\) More Štokavian examples are given in Matešić 1970, 175–176. Cf. also in Prčanj and Ozrinići the original accent in the phrase *strašnī sȗd* ‘Judgement Day’ as opposed to the usual form *strȃšnī* (Rešetar 1900, 128).

The ˋ ˉ pattern in long vowel adjectives is quite frequent in Prapatnice (Vrgorska krajina, my data) – in the original a.p. *c* (*lādnī* ‘cold’, tēškī) but elsewhere as well (*glātkī* ‘smooth’, *niskī* ‘low’), often beside a younger variant ˘ ˘ (*bisnī / bȋsnī* ‘mad, rabid’). The ˚ ˇ type appears in almost all -CC- adjectives (i.e. adjectives with the stem ending in a consonantal group) – it is most frequent there (although it does not appear in all adjectives, for instance in some -an adjectives which are not a.p. *C* or do not stem from the original a.p. *c*). This old pattern appears in some suffixless adjectives of the original a.p. *c* (for instance *gūstā čórba* ‘dense soup’, *br̄stī* ‘fast’). The ˚ ˇ pattern is frequent in common idioms, like in *čvrstī bètōn* ‘solid concrete’ (idiom), but *tō je tȃj čvȓstī bètōn* ‘it’s is that (already mentioned) solid concrete’ (normal attribute + noun).

\[ vrūčī / vrūčī \text{(secondarily)}, glādnī / glādnī \text{hungry}, krātkī / krātkī, krūpnī / krūpnī, mīsnī / mīsnī \text{meaty}, plītīkī / plītīkī \text{shallow}, prāznī / prāznī \text{empty}, rēktī / rījetkī, svījesnī / svījesnī \text{conscious}, strāsnī / strāsnī, tēškī / tēškī, vītkī / vītkī \text{slim}, žītkī / žītkī. \]

\(^{163}\) However, this isolated piece of data is not very reliable since it can easily be secondary.

\(^{164}\) The old accent is also seen in the idiom *ne prdōklači lȗdijēh* ‘don’t speak rubbish’ (my data) – cf. the archaic gen. form *lȗdijēh* here with the usual innovative def. form *lȗdī*.

\(^{165}\) As can be seen, the region of Imotski / Vrgorac / Metković again has some common accentual isoglosses.
In Štokavian, the morphological distinction of the indef. vs. def. declension is not preserved in all cases. The following cases have the morphological distinction (first we give the indef. and then the def. form): nom/acc. sg. m. drȃg – drȃgī (older drȃgī & passim), gen/(acc). sg. m/n. drȃga (younger dr ága) – drȃgōg(a), dat/loc. sg. m/n. drȃgu (or younger dr águ) – drȃgōm(u/e). In the second group of cases, the forms have become the same by the expected phonological-morphological historical changes (if we disregard the difference in accent and length of the endings): nom/acc. sg. n. drȃgo (younger dr ágo) – drȃgō (older drȃgō & passim), nom. sg. f. & nom/acc. pl. n. drȃga – drȃgā, gen. sg. f. drȃgē – drȃgē, acc. sg. f. drȃgu – drȃgū, instr. sg. f. drȃgōm – drȃgōm, nom. pl. m. drȃgi – drȃgī, nom. pl. f. drȃge – drȃgē, acc. pl. m/f. drȃge – drȃgē. In all other cases, the old indef. forms (identical to nominal forms) were lost and def. endings were taken instead. However, these new forms have taken the accent from other indef. cases and thus differentiate themselves from the def. forms: dat/loc. sg. f. drȃgōj (by analogy to the nom sg. dr ága, gen. sg. drȃgē, instr. sg. drȃgōm) – drȃgōj, instr. sg. drȃgīm (see below for the explanation) – drȃgīm, gen. pl. drȃgīh – drȃgīh, dat/loc/instr. pl. drȃgīm(a) – drȃgīm(a). By taking the rising accent (i.e. end stress) in these forms, a new distinction of indef. and def. forms is created, the same that is present in a.p. B (indef. drȃgīm : def. drȃgīm ⇐ drȃgīm in C like indef. źútīm : def. źȗtīm in B). The rising accent of the new a.p. C instr. sg. m/n. indef. forms (like drȃgīm) is most problematic, since there was probably no rising accents in the old sg. indef. declension, except perhaps in loc. sg. *drȃgu (see above), and since the PSl. indef. instr. sg. form was *dȏrgomь with initial stress. In feminine forms, where the rising accent was present in gen. sg. drȃgē and inst. sg. drȃgōm the new dat/loc. sg. form drȃgōj is not such a problem (cf. also the PSl. indef. a.p. c dat. sg. *dȏrǯę but loc. sg. *dorǯę with end stress, like in nominal ā-stems). The new masculine form drȃgīm can be interpreted as analogical in stress to the feminine form drȃgōm, where this accent is expected (cf. instr. sg. glȃvōm ‘head’). Another influence may have been the expected end stress in a.p. C plural forms, especially that of dat. pl., which is identical to the instr. sg. after the fall of final yers. In plural forms, the

---
166 Cf. in the Čak. dial. of Dobrinj on the island of Krk (M i l č e t i ć 1895, 116) indef. loc. sg. v lípi koñği : def. loc. sg. v lípoj koñği.
rising accent (end stress) is expected in accordance to the accent of the old indef. forms – gen. pl. *drāḡ, dat. pl. m/n. *drāḡōm, f. *drāḡām, loc. m/n. *drāzēh, f. *drāḡāh, instr. m/n. *drāḡī, f. *drāḡāmi (these supposed forms, identical to nominal ones, are nowhere attested and must have been lost very early). In the standard language and in some Štok. dialects, this indef/def. distinction is well preserved, while in some of them it may be lost in oblique cases (then the accents of def. forms tend to prevail) and, of course, the indef. declension generally tends to be lost in many dialects as well. Nevertheless, even after old indef. forms like gen. sg. *drāga, dat. sg. *drâgu (which are preserved, for instance, in the dialects of Dalmatinska Zagora or Posavina) are lost, the old distinction between indef. and def. forms can be maintained by accent: indef. gen. sg. *drāgōg – def. gen. sg. *drâgōg (the same in dat. sg. *drāgōm – *drâgōm). Cf. in Posavina (Ivšić 1913 2, 42–44): gen. sg. m/n. mrtvōg, loc. sg. m/n. mrtvōm, instr. sg. m/n. mrtvīm, mlādīm, instr. sg. f. mrtvōm, gen. pl. mrtvī, sūvī. Here, only the accent tells us that these are indef. forms (def. forms would have the accent mřv-, mlād-, sūv- in all forms). Such an accentual distinction (older and newer) can be found in a.p. B as well, cf. for instance instr. sg. m/n. indef. žūtīm – def. žūtīm, etc.

ČAKAVIAN (Vrgada)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>short vowel</td>
<td>m f n</td>
<td>m f n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bōs bōsā bōso</td>
<td>bosī bošā bosō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long vowel</td>
<td>m f n</td>
<td>m f n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sūh sūhā sūho</td>
<td>sūhī Sūȟā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.p. C is well preserved in indef. forms in most Čakavian dialects – what is more, it usually spreads to some of the original a.p. b adjectives as well. In def. forms, the original -ī is preserved in short vowel stems like bosī in some dialects, while analogical bōśī appears in others. Cf. bosī, bošā, bosō on Vrgada (Jurišić 1966, 83). In long vowel adjectives, the original pattern has almost completely perished. The drāg (C) type adjectives in Čakavian

---

have drǎgī pattern in def. forms, like in many Štokavian dialects, except for the fact that, unlike in Štokavian, adjectives where the original accent is preserved are very rare, cf. jākī beside jākũ in Novi Vinodolski. In Čakavian, the original -i in long vowel stems is best preserved in denominal adjectives on -skũ, -nũ, -jũ, which are always definite (see below). This accentual pattern, like in Posavina, is especially frequent in secondary forms, where it would not be expected historically, cf. modrũ ‘blue’, źuhkũ, novũ (Novi Vinodolski), golũ, dugũ, glatkũ (Vrgada), etc. But see also večnũ ‘eternal’ in Novi171 which might be old. The change *dragũ ⇒ drãgũ occurs by analogy to a.p. B., which undoes the long : short alternation between indef. and def. forms. The middle type *drãgũ does not occur anywhere in Štokavian. However, it seems that it perhaps may be found in Čakavian, cf. the already cited, but quite exceptional, form jākũ in Novi Vinodolski.


---

168 Беличъ 1909, 205.
169 The examples are from Zubčić 2004, 626.
170 Jurišić 1966, 83.
172 Forms like drãgũ are to be explained by analogy (to a.p. B.) in Čakavian, which occurs due to the tendency for length to be generalized to all forms. There is no need for abstract (and somewhat ahistorical) phonological rules of some sort of retraction from a length to a preceding length proposed by Langston (2007, 126).
173 Cf. in Vrboska (Hvar) both bũoš and gũol in a.p. C and on Brač both bũos and gũl in a.p. B.

As for innovation, cf. on Rab (Kušar 1894, 33) blēd – blēdā – +blēdo (the same in drāg, glūh, lēn, etc., and secondarily in vrūč, žūt) but generalized ^ to all forms (including f.) in adjectives such as krīv, grūb, gūst, žīv (and secondarily in bēl). In Rijeka (Strohal 1895, 158), some of the old a.p. c adjectives shift to a.p. B (blēd, glūh, slān ‘salty’, žīv, etc.), which is otherwise very rare in Čak., while the other group generalizes ^ to all forms (thus de facto shifting to a.p. A: – thus in drāg, gūst, lēv ‘left’, nēm ‘dumb’, dīv ‘wild’, etc.). A similar situation is in Gacka (Kranjević 2003), where a.p. B: includes žīv – žīva – žīvo (also jāk, krīv) while a.p. A: (lūd – lūda – lūdo with generalized ^ to all forms) includes the adj. līp, blāg, glūv ‘deaf’, gūst, túp and secondarily also bēl (cf. u pōl bēla dāna ‘out of nowhere (lit. in the middle of a white day)’) and vrūč. The generalization of ^ occurs in Filipjakov as well: drāg – drāga – drāgo (likewise in sūv ‘dry’, žīv, etc.) and Preko: drōg – drōga – drōgo (the same in sūh, žīv, etc.). The original mobility in Filipjakov can be seen in bōs – bōsa / bōsā – bōso

174 The forms bōs and blēd are already the same. Then, after the pretonic length disappears, bosā = bledā, so it is no wonder that bōso gets a secondary length, which is present in the def. form bōsi as well.

175 Cf. also the oblique cases: the indef. gen/loc. pl. +blāgīh, dat. pl. +blāgīn, instr. pl. +blāgīmi (cf. def. gen/loc. pl. +blāgīh, dat. pl. +blāgīn, instr. pl. +blāgīmi). For the shortness of indef. endings, see below.

176 The adjectives from this subgroup may have fixed ^ by analogy to Venetian loans such as cār, zvělt, which have this pattern originally (although another Venetism, skūr, is in the type B).

177 The data for Filipjakov and Preko are recorded by Nikola Vuletić.
Historical development of adjective accentuation in Croatian...

(\( ^{\prime} \) in n. is analogical to m. and to kanovačko lengthening in f.). In Preko, the accent is generalized in this adjective as well: \( bu\’\os - b\'osa - b\'oso \).

As for the end stress in def. forms, which is originally a trait of a.p. C, it seems that the tone is always falling in Čakavian (unlike in Štok., see above) although additional data is needed. Cf. in Orlec (Houtzagers 1985, 111, 116): nom. sg. -i, -ǎ, gen. sg. -e, acc. sg. -u, loc. sg. -ôj, nom. pl. -e, in Orbanić (Kalsbeek 1998, 129): nom. sg. -i, -\( ^{\prime}\)ô, -a, gen. sg. -\( ^{\prime}\)éga, -e, dat. sg. -\( ^{\prime}\)ému, -\( ^{\prime}\)e, loc. sg. -\( ^{\prime}\)ên, -\( ^{\prime}\)e, instr. sg. -\( ^{\prime}\)ên, -\( ^{\prime}\)ôn, nom. pl. -i, gen/loc. pl. -\( ^{\prime}\)èh, dat. pl. -\( ^{\prime}\)ên, acc. pl. -i / -\( ^{\prime}\)èh, -\( ^{\prime}\)ê, instr. pl. -\( ^{\prime}\)émi (the variant forms with the short accent are secondary) and on Vrgada (Jurišić 1973): nom. sg. -i, -\( ^{\prime}\)â, -ô, gen. sg. muškôga, sinovlë ‘son’s’, acc. sg. f. desnû, loc. sg. f. na turskôj ‘Turkish’, instr. sg. f. vražjôn ‘devil’s’, nom. pl. muškî, tankë ‘thin’. The ‘falling’ variants, i.e. the stress on the first part of the ending, are generalized in Russian as well, cf. cyxôú – gen. sg. cyxôzo\(^{178}\) – dat. sg. cyxômy, etc.

In Čakavian, one finds end stress in the adjectival gen. and dat. sg. forms -ogà / -egà and -omû / -emû in Northern Čakavian dialects, for instance in Rijeka (Strohal 1895, 158) and Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 92–93). In Rijeka, forms like gen. sg. zûtegà, dat. sg. zûtemû are presented as variants of the old indef. forms gen. sg. zûtà, dat. sg. zûtû, so these forms appear only as alternative (secondary) forms in indef. declension. Strohal’s examples are from a.p. B: and it is not clear if such an accent can appear in a.p. A: < a.p. c as well. However, it is clear, as we have seen, that a great deal of the old a.p. c adjectives shifted to a.p. B: there. In Grobnik, the accents -ogà / -egà and -omû / -emû appear in all accentual paradigms in indef. declension (Zubčić 2004, 626; Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 102, 105).\(^{179}\)

\(^{178}\) But cf. also a Russian aristocratic surname Cuxóvo, which could perhaps be a trace of the old accentuation of gen. sg.

\(^{179}\) In Lukežić, Zubčić 2007 the description method is rather strange since instead of paradigms exemplified by certain words only endings are given and those are defined by accentedness / non-accentedness and not by accentual paradigm. In addition, the position of stress and accentual types of different accentual patterns are indicated by symbols in tables instead of by concrete examples. Still, in Zubčić 2004, 626 it is explicitly stated that in the Grobnik dialect the stress in the sg. of indef. declension is always on the last or only vowel of the grammatical morpheme. The following examples are given: gen. sg. čisto/egà ‘clean’, visoko/egà ‘tall’, dat. sg. čisto/emû, visoko/emû.
In spite of what might seem obvious at first glance, these forms are not the reflexes of the expected *-ōgā and *-ōmū from the PSl. def. *-ajegō and *-ujemū. That is clear from the following facts. First of all, the first syllable of the ending is short (cf. the long unaccented def. -ōga / -ēga and -ōmu / -ēmu in Grobnik). Secondly, such an accent occurs not only in a.p. C but in a.p. B as well (what is more, the only concrete form from Rijeka is indeed a.p. B, despite the fact that the local synchronic a.p. B: includes many old a.p. c adjectives). Thirdly, this accent does not occur in the def. but rather in the indef. declension, where these def. endings are obviously secondary (in Grobnik, only these new indef. endings exist, while in Rijeka they coexist with the older indef. endings). How did these secondary forms develop? In Rijeka, the accent of the old indef. forms gen. sg. zūtā, dat. sg. zūtū was simply taken into new indef. forms with the endings -ega, -emu thus making zūtegā, zūtemū – the ending is still -ā, -ū, but new -eg-, -em- are inserted in front of it. Possible sources of analogy are pronominal forms like jednegā, jednemū (Strohal 1895, 164), where such an accent is expected. The borrowing of the pronominal accent / ending can be supposed to be based on the short first syllable of the ending, which is typical for pronouns (as well as for new indef. forms). Besides, many pronouns have the indefinite-looking nom. sg. with gen/dat. sg. with short (non-contracted) ending -ogā / -omū. When the old indef. (nominal) endings were in the process of disappearing in Northern Čakavian, the model for younger endings was obviously constituted by (indef.) pronominal forms and not def. adjectival forms. Cf. also Grobnik indef. forms kogā / kēgā (short first syllable and end stress) as opposed to kōga / kēga (long and stressed first syllable). In this way, the original distinction of def. and indef. gen. and dat. sg. is preserved by accent, despite the fact that the original indef. forms begin to disappear, cf. in Rijeka: indef. gen. sg. zūtā : def. gen. sg. zūtega, indef. dat. sg. zūtū : def. dat. sg. zūtemu ⇒ indef. gen. sg. zūtegā : def. gen. sg. zūtega, indef. dat. sg. zūtemū : def. dat. sg. zūtemu. So the conclusion is that these forms are local innovations and not PSl. archaisms.

Another interesting fact is that end-stressed endings of oblique plural cases are short in the Čakavian indef. declension, despite the fact that those

---

are originally old def. forms (taken secondarily into the indef. declension), which should have long vowels due to contraction. Cf. Stand. Croat. indef. dat/loc/instr. pl. žútīm(a) : def. dat/loc/instr. pl. žútīma with the Grobnik forms (Lukežič, Zubčić 2007, 93) indef. gen/loc. pl. -ih, instr. pl. -īmi. Also Rijeka (Strohal 1895, 157) indef. loc. pl. zūtēh, instr. pl. zūtēmi\(^{181}\). The short endings in dat. pl. -im, gen/loc. pl. -ih, instr. pl. -imi are present in Križanič’s dialect as well. In unstressed indef. declension (and in def. declension, where endings are always unstressed), cf. in Grobnik the length in the gen/loc. pl. -īh and instr. pl. -īmi. Short stressed endings are probably due to analogy to pronominal endings like the gen/loc. pl. ňȉh, instr. pl. ňȉmi, even though short vowel is not expected there neither (cf. PSl. *jȉxъ, *jimı, Дыбо 1981, 36). Such an analogy would be in accord with the influence of pronominal -ogȁ, -omȕ on new adjectival forms (see above).

**KAIJKAVIAN (Velika Rakovica)**\(^{182}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th></th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blěd ‘pale’</td>
<td>blěd’a</td>
<td>blědo</td>
<td>blěd’a</td>
<td>blědo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Archaic Kajkavian dialects preserve the original a.p. C pattern (mlȃd – mlȃd’a – mlȃdo), which is, if it changes, most often transformed into a pattern with the generalized ^\(^{-}\) (like in some Čakavian dialects). This a.p. C type includes also the old long vowel a.p. b adjectives, since Kajkavian mostly does not have a synchronic a.p. B (opposed to a.p. C) in root adjectives, with the exception of Rožić’s Prigorje (see below). Thus, the three PSl. types are reduced to two types in Kajkavian (like in many Štok. and Čak. dialects as well), with the distinction of two types being in the length of indef. forms (sȉt : drȁg / črȃn) and the intonation of def. forms (sȋti : drȃgi / črȃni).

In V. Rakovica (March 1981, 265), all long vowel adjectives are in a.p. C:, i.e. the old long vowel a.p. b and a.p. c have merged (e.g. mlȃd, žȗv and črȃn, žȗt are all in a.p. C:), while the short vowel a.p. C’ (type gȏl – golȃ –

\(^{181}\) In dat. pl. Grobnik has -in and Rijeka -en, which is due to pre-resonant lengthening, typical for Čakavian.

\(^{182}\) March 1981, 265.
gōlo) consists of gōl, prōst and lōš, presumably all secondarily. The old a.p. b and c have merged in Bednja (Jedvaj 1956, 305) as well: drāog ‘dear’, mlāod ‘young’ are the same as žōut ‘yellow’, vrōuč ‘hot’ (there are no special indef. f. and n. forms in Bednja), etc. In Turopolje (Šojat 1981, 400), a.p. A: with ^ in all forms (*C) also consists of both the old a.p. c and a.p. b (mlāt – mlāda, the same in drāk ‘dear’, žīf ‘live’ and cën, bēl, etc.). In Ozalj (Težak 1981, 272), the type C (lip – lípa – lípo) also encompasses the old a.p. c (drāk, güst, līn) as well as the old a.p. b (bēl, vrūč, žūt). In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002), cf. a.p. C in žīf – žiwa (with regular retraction) – živo – def. žīvi, krīf – krīva (acc. sg. na krīvu) – krīvo – def. krīvi (secondarily) and bōs – bōsa – bōso, while in most other adjectives only the def. form is attested (lēpi, lēni, glūhi, gōsti ‘dense’, mlādi, sūhi, etc.).

In Prigorje (Rožić 1893–1894 2, 143–144), the process is apparently opposite to the rest of Kajkavian – the original a.p. b and c merge in a.p. B: (mlād – mlāda – mlādi, gen. sg. mlādega and mladēga, etc. – likewise in güst, žīv but also in čēn, žūt), not in a.p. C:. However, this again yields the same result as in other Kajkavian dialects – the merger of the original a.p. b and c. Still, the old a.p. b : c distinction is preserved in Prigorje in a limited way in the fact that some of the old a.p. c adjectives preserve, mostly with variants, the accent ^ in the neuter form, while the old a.p. b adjectives do not exhibit that (with the exception of the adj. vrūč). Cf. žīvo / žīva, krīvo (only this form!), slēpo / slēpo, sūvo / sūvo – the other adjectives, except for vrūčë / vrūče, have only ’ in the neuter form.

In Kajkavian a.p. C, def. forms have a neo-acute on the stem (from the original a.p. b): mlādi, sūhi, etc. Unlike Štok. and Čak. forms like mlādi, Kajk. mlādi could also be the result of Ivšič’s retraction (*mladî > *mlādî > mlādi like *zābava > *zābava). Old end stressed -i is preserved in traces, cf. e.g. divjî ‘wild’ in V. Rakovica (only def. form) but mostly in denominal adjectives with the suffixes -ji, -ni, -ski, such as muškî ‘male’, zubnî ‘dental’, ludskî ‘human’ in V. Rakovica, luckî ‘human’, cvitmî ‘flower’, zubnî in Ozalj, etc. Still, Valjavec (1895, 137) gives the forms dragî (originally a.p. c), dobri (originally a.p. b) from old texts. A remnant of this type is also the form trdî ‘hard’ (beside younger tĕdi) in Turopolje (Šojat 1982, 400).

183 Valjavec (1894, 225) has the form žīv in his Kajkavian but only ’ in all other forms (žīva – žīvo – pl. žīvi – žīve, etc.).
Težak (1981, 267–268) claims for Ozalj that most of the adjectives in the indef. form have the long rising accent in the forms -ėga, -ėmu. The forms given are (268–270, 272): črnėga / črnėmu, dobrėga / dobrėmu ‘good’, tetinėga ‘aunt’s’, pametnėga / pametnėmu ‘clever’, zrelėga, strašnėga ‘terrible’, goručėga ‘burning’, etc. The forms -ėga, -ėmu look like the reflexes of PSl. *-ajėgo, *-ujemū in the def. declension of the old a.p. c, but the problem is that these endings appear in the indef. declension (def. declension has stem stress) and that they are found not only in a.p. C but in all accentual paradigms. In Ozalj, the first syllable of the ending was originally short, as can be seen from the open e (Težak 1981, 212) – the same in Prigorje (Rožić 1893–1894, 140, 142–143) forms zdravėga / zdravėmu (a), žutėga / žutėmu (b), mladėga / mladėmu (c), with generalized accent (with root stress variants) and in Križanić’s dialect (see below). This, as in the case of Čakavian, shows that these endings are not the reflexes of the PSl. a.p. c def. forms. It is possible that, as in Rijeka Čakavian, old forms like gen. sg. *dobra and dat. sg. *dobra (a.p. B) got secondary endings -ega / -emu, which, by analogy to the original forms, maintained desinential stress (*dobrega / dobremu) that is not connected to the old a.p. c def. stress. In this scenario, other than the proposed contamination of the endings *-ā and *-ega, one should also assume the secondary spread of this accent from a.p. B to other accentual paradigms but, as in North Čakavian, pronominal forms such as mojėga ‘mine’, mojemu, čijėga ‘whose’, ovėga ‘this’, jenėga ‘one’, etc. were surely influential as well. Of course, if one were to assume that these forms are indeed connected to the old def. a.p. c, one could also assume that pronominal endings, with a short first syllable, have influenced the original inherited adjectival end stressed forms with the original long first syllable. However, this scenario does not look probable for the already mentioned reasons (e.g. that this end stress appears only in innovative indef. forms, etc.).

Another possibility is that the end stress in the gen/dat. sg. is analogical to the stress on the ending in other indef. forms (instr. pl. dobrìmi,185 gen. sg. f. dobré, inst. sg. m/n. dobrím186 / f. dobrûm, etc.) although the motivation for *-egā / -emū and not *-ēga or *-ēga would be unclear. In the Ozalj area, such an accentuation

184 Of course, if one were to assume that these forms are indeed connected to the old def. a.p. c, one could also assume that pronominal endings, with a short first syllable, have influenced the original inherited adjectival end stressed forms with the original long first syllable. However, this scenario does not look probable for the already mentioned reasons (e.g. that this end stress appears only in innovative indef. forms, etc.).

185 Cf. the shortness of the stressed ending in Čak. The shortness could be explained by analogy to the old nom. pl. *dobrī as well.

186 Cf. Štok. indef. instr. m/n. dobrīm (B), mlādīm (C).
existed already in 17th century, which is obvious in Križanić’s gen/dat. sg. forms: gen. sg. bridkogó, Sinégò, dat. sg. Sinjemù (from Sîn – Sîna – Sînje, B.), gen. sg. Dobrogò (B), Tešćegò (originally a.p. b), etc. Križanić’s forms attest the shortness of the first syllable of the ending (cf. also the pronominal forms Mojegò, Tvojegò, as well as indef. gen. sg. dobrá, dat. sg. Dobrù). 187 In Križanić’s language, end stressed gen/dat. sg. appear only in the indef. a.p. B (давногò ‘ancient’, praznogò) and a.p. C forms (простогò from прôst), which also points to the secondarity of these forms. In def. forms, the accent is never on the last syllable of the ending (cf., for instance, Križanić’s мужскéго).

In Turopolje, in the oblique cases of the def. declension one finds (Šojat 1981, 400): gen. sg. dobròga, dat. sg. dobròmu (which may be derived from *dобрóga, *dобрómu) along with dòbroga, dòbromu, and also zelenòga / zêlenoga ‘green’, črlenòga ‘red’, kravòga / kòrvavoga ‘bloody’, kupovnòga (from kupovnî) ‘store-bought’, zmësnòga (from zmësnî) ‘meat’, vražòga ‘devil’s’, etc. Although this is not a very archaic dialect, it is not clear how one could explain such forms if not as an archaism, i.e. as traces of the original a.p. c def. forms that are preserved in some adjectives. It is true that this accent occurs in the old a.p. b adjectives as well (dобрóga, zelenòga, črlenòga), but it is present in the old a.p. c adjectives (kravòga) and, what is especially significant, it also appears in the oblique cases of nom. sg. forms in -î (zmësnì – zmësnòga), which is exactly where one would expect it historically.

Cf. in Slovene:

mlâd – mláda – mladô

Slovene preserves the original a.p. C pattern (cf. acc. sg. f. mladô, nom. pl. m. mlâdî, nom. pl. f. mlâdê, etc.). 188 A.p. C consists of original a.p. c adjectives (such as bòs, blâg, drâg, glûh, etc.) but also of some secondary cases (like mîl and pîln of the original a.p. a 189 or žîlt ‘yellow’ of the original a.p. b). In Slovene, a.p. C adjectives (but also adj. of other accentual paradigms, cf. stârega / staregà and stâremu / staremù the same

---

189 A > C by analogical transfer of neo-circumflex from def. forms to indef. ones and then by reanalysis of the neo-circumflex as the old circumflex and the rise of a.p. C accentuation in other forms.
as mládega / mladegã, mládemu / mlademû)\(^{190}\) can have end stress in the oblique cases: bosõgã, bledõgã, dragõgã, suhõgã, etc. Such an accent now appears in the indef. declension, but in the 19th century they occurred in the def. declension as well (Stanikiewicz 1993, 66–67). It is not clear if these cases are archaic (thus reflexes of the original a.p. c def. end stress) or innovative, as in some Ĉakavian and Kajkavian dialects.

**a.p. C:** 'blāg mild (Štok. also B:), 'blěd pale (Štok. also B:, PSl. c),\(^{191}\) 'bos barefoot, 'břž quick, 'cěl whole (Štok. also B:, PSl. b/c),\(^{192}\) 'čěst frequent, 'čvřšt hard, desnî right (also B > B:\(^{193}\)) 'dív wild (Čak., in Štok. only divljî),\(^{194}\) 'dřág dear, 'glůh deaf, 'glůp\(^{195}\) stupid (PSl. b), 'gnjîl rotten (Štok. also B:, > A),\(^{196}\) 'gůst dense, 'gîd ugly (PSl. b/c), 'grûb rude, 'ják strong (Štok. B:, PSl. c),\(^{197}\) 'kůs narrow (< *Č, also > A), 'krïv guilty, 'kînj broken, unfinished, 'krût rigid, 'kûs tailless, 'lěn lazy, 'lěp beautiful, 'ljût angry (PSl. b), 'lûd crazy, 'mlâd young (Štok. also B:),\(^{198}\) 'nâg naked,

---

\(^{190}\) Valjavec 1894, 144, 170.

\(^{191}\) For the reconstruction of PSl. a.p. c, see Дьбо 1981, 109 (cf. also Czech bledý). As already said, this adjective is frequently a.p. B: in Štok. (in dialects that preserve the old a.p. B: / a.p. C: opposition), e.g. in Imotska and Vrgorska Krajina and in Posavina (cf. blûd in Ivišić 1913 2, 44, which is corroborated by my data from Sikerevci, Orubica, Babina Greda and Kobaš).


\(^{193}\) The a.p. C indef. form is preserved in adverbs like nûdesno, ūdesno to the right, zdèsna from the right, cf. also Vrgada sâ.desna (Jurišić 1973).

\(^{194}\) Cf. indef. dîv (a.p. A: < a.p. c) in Rijeka (Strohal 1895, 158), dîv (C) in Orlec (Houtzagers 1985, 121) and dîv in Crikvenica (Ivančić-Dusper 2003). It is quite possible that the Ĉakavian a.p. C is secondary, considering a.p. A:\(^{195}\) of Štok. divan (see below). We are dealing with the same Proto-Indo-European root (*deyw-*) in both cases, however it is not impossible that a differentiation (including accentual one) ensued due to differing semantics.

\(^{195}\) This is not a native word (cf. ARj).

\(^{196}\) In Štokavian, the vowel in gnîl is shortened after the vocalization of the final l and thus we get gnîo. By analogy, this can yield gnîla, gnîlo (and further gnîla, gnîlo, etc.) instead of the older gnîla, gnîlo / gnîlo (cf. thus in Dubrovnik, Rešetar 1900, 114).

\(^{197}\) Cf. Дьбо 1981, 36 for a.p. c (also Czech jaký). In Štokavian, a.p. B: is attested in Dubrovnik and Dalmatinska zagora all way to Posavina.

\(^{198}\) Cf. e.g. Posavian mlâk (Ivišić 1913 2, 44 and my data from Slobodnica) and mlâko – pl. mlâki in Prapatnice (Vrgorska Krajina). This is in accord with mlâčan – mlâčna – mlâčno or mlâčan in Štokavian.

The accentuation of gen/dat. sg. in a.p. c definite adjectives declension

As we have seen, in PSl. the gen/dat. sg. m/n. of the a.p. c def. declension were end-stressed: gen. sg. *-ajegō, dat. sg. *-ujemū. After contraction and analogical changes, one would expect Croat. gen. sg. *-ōgā and dat. sg. *-ōmū from these forms. But in a.p. C def. adj. declension one does not find end-stress in the standard language nor in most dialects, instead, the accent is on the first syllable of the ending. Cf. Stand. Croat. tūđī, gen. sg. tūdēga, dat. sg. tūdēmu. Still, we have shown a number of cases where the original desinential stress is possibly preserved:

Posavina (Ivšić) – gen. sg. -ōg
Ozrinići (Crna Gora) – ĭuckī human, gen. sg. ĭuckōga, dat. sg. ĭuckóme
Turopolje – gen. sg. -ōga, dat. sg. -ōmu (zmēsnȋ, gen. sg. zmēsnōga)

Rijeka & Grobnik – indef. gen. sg. -o/egā, dat. sg. -o/emū
Prigorje (Rožić) – gen. sg. -ēga, dat. sg. -ēmu
Ozalj – indef. gen. sg. -éga, dat. sg. -ēmu
Križanić (17th ct.) – indef. gen. sg. -ōgō, dat. sg. -omū

These forms do not belong to the same category. The first three examples are indeed cases of preservation of the original PSl. gen/dat. sg. def. a.p. c forms. These forms appear in the def. declension and in adjectives where

\(^{199}\) Ivšić 1913 2, 44 gives the accentuation sȃm – samȃ – samō for some Posavian dial. I have the older form samȃ attested beside the younger sāma in Babina Greda. The Babina Greda form **sāmā mentioned in Kapović 2008b, 119f and Kapović 2008a, 30 is incorrect (the only forms that appear in the dialect are samȃ and sāma). The rise of the forms samā / samō is not clear. This might be an analogy to the expected shortening in the old forms *samoğā, *samomū (sam is originally declined pronominally – historically speaking, it is not really an adjective).


\(^{201}\) Adj. tüj (tūđ) in Senj (Mo̱guš 1966, 76) is shortened due to the influence of the old def. form. Many Štok. dialects preserve the old def. a.p. C form only in this adj. (this only applies to root adjectives, of course) because here the indef. forms are frequently lost and often only the def. form tüdı / tuđı exists, without corresponding indef. forms whose length could influence the def. ones.
one expects the old a.p. c. Posavian - ogl, Montenegrin řuckóga / řuckóme and probably Turopolje ending - og / - omu should be interpreted as reflexes of the PSl. *-ajegó and *-ujemú.

The other cases are due to innovations that only accidentally look like the original PSl. forms. Firstly, in Rijeka / Grobnik and Ozalj / Križanić one deals with forms appearing in the indef. declension only (in Rožić’s description, there is no distinction of def/indef. adjectives), where these endings cannot be original, while in the def. declension such forms do not exist, which seems significant. Secondly, Kajkavian and Čakavian forms have the short first ending syllable (the same as in pronominal - ogá, - omu), which clearly points to the secondarity of such forms and their development by analogy to pronominal - ogá / - omu forms like jednogá, samogá, onomu, etc. Thirdly, these forms are not limited to a.p. C in any of the mentioned dialects but appear in other accentual paradigms as well.

When dealing with the description of the accentual development of other adjectives (i.e. the ones with suffixes), we shall mostly deal with details specific for those types of adjectives, leaving behind what has already been said in the description of root adjectives, i.e. as a general rule, the shared developments of root adjectives and adjectives with suffixes will not be repeated.

For the data and reconstruction of the PSl. accentuation of *-ьнъ adjectives, cf. Дыбо 1981, 72–94.

*ьнъ adjectives

1. a.p. a

Proto-Slavic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gádьnъ</td>
<td>*gádьna</td>
<td>*gádьmo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘despicable, ugly’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Proto-Slavic, a.p. a has constant root stress, the same as in root adjectives.

Cf. Old Russian:\[202\]

вѣръ – вѣра – вѣрно ‘faithful’

\[202\] Дыбо 1981, 72.
A.p. A is preserved in modern Russian as well, although with some paradigm shifts.

Štokavian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gădan</td>
<td>gădna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Old short vowel a.p. c adjectives, such as mòćan ‘powerful’ (cf. móc ‘power’, C) and čăstan ‘honorable’ (cf. căst ‘honor’, C), have merged with the original a.p. a. It seems that this was a general change in all dialects, the reason being the fact that the old acute and the old short circumflex both yield the same reflex (") in Štok/Čak/Kajk., cf. *gădьpъ > gădan as well as *čěštъpъ > čăstan. The old a.p. c adjectives lose the accentual mobility (and stress shifts to proclitics) and thus become identical to the old a.p. a adjectives. The exception here is only the adj. bōlan ‘painful’ and Križanić’s 17th ct. short vowel mobile system (see below). Of course, it is clear that adjectives such as mòćan, čăstan, sōčan ‘juicy’ (cf. sōk ‘juice’, C) cannot be the original a.p. a adjectives since they have originally short vowels *o and *ь in their stems.

Other secondary members of the a.p. A group are also adjectives such as vjēčan ‘eternal’, bītan ‘important’, svjēstan ‘conscious’ (however, cf. the variants vjēčan, bītan, svjēstan below), also originally a.p. c adjectives (cf. vijēk ‘age’, bīt ‘essence’, svijēst ‘consciousness’, all C) but with a long vowel (*ě and *i are originally long vowels). The shortening of the original *věčъpъ and *bīťъpъ procedes in the following way. According to the rules of the old long circumflex shortening, i.e. the ‘One mora law’,

\[^{203}\text{Cf. the examples *gōrdъ > grād city, *gōrda > grāda city (gen. sg.), *bōbъpъ > būbanj drum, *mōžъsko > mūško male, *mōldostъ > mlādōst youth, *sīnove > sīnovи sons. The ‘One mora law’ states that PSl. *” is preserved in Štok/Čak/Kajk. only in front of one or fewer morae, while it is shortened in front of one and half or more morae (PSl. *e/o counts as one mora, *ь/ъ as half a mora and all other vowels as two morae, except in final open syllables where they count as one mora). See Kapović 2011b for more details and examples.}\]
*věčъnъ – *věčъná – *věčъno would yield *vijěčan (as bǔbanj ‘drum’, glȁdan ‘hungry’) – *vijěčna (like gûmno)204 – *vjěčno (like mûško ‘male’).

The shortened form would also be expected in all sg. oblique m/n. forms, i.e. in all forms with no yer at the end of the word, e.g. in gen. sg. *vjěčna, dat. sg. *vjěčnu (from *věčъná, *věčъnu) and in feminine forms with initial stress (e.g. in acc. sg. *věčъnǫ > *vjěčnu, cf. acc. sg. djȅcu ‘children’), etc. (see below), as well as in the original def. form *vječnî (cf. Križanić wecznîm), as well as in compound adjectives like vjekòvječan ‘eternal’ and dugòvječan ‘long lived’ (*-věčъnъ in compounds). The short falling accent was then generalized by analogy to the forms in which it was expected. By this process, with the disappearance of the proclitic accentual shift, the shift to a.p. A de facto occurred. Next to shortened variants like vjěčan, bȗtan (if it is not a literary newer word, see below), svjȅstan, the variants vijěčan, bȗtan, svijȇstan (some of them quite rare) also exist – here, ̑ from other forms was generalized (possibly due to the influence of the nouns vijȇk, bȗt, svijȇst).

For other cases of generalizations and shortenings, see below. In adjectives where ̑ is generalized, the shift to a.p. A is also present. In adjectives (or adjective variants) where ̑ is generalized, a.p. C: is preserved (of course, if it exists in the system). Levellings and different variants existing in dialects are different in different adjectives.

In effect, almost all short vowel adjectives (except bȍlan in some dialects) shift to a.p. A (regardless whether they stem from the original a.p. a, short vowel a.p. c or shortened long vowel a.p. c), while a.p. B: and a.p. A³: (reflexes of the original a.p. b) and a.p. C: consist of long vowel adjectives only. In this way, a sort of complementary distribution by root quantity arises and the PSl. accentual paradigm opposition becomes relevant for long vowel adjectives only.

In resonant-final stem adjectives (such as sȉlan ‘mighty’, žȅljan ‘anxious’, vȍljan ‘willing’, vjȅran ‘faithful’) in f. and n. in Štokavian dialects with pre-resonant lengthening in closed syllables (i.e. all except Eastern Bosnian dialect), the said lengthening occurs and we get sȉlna – sȉlno, etc. By analogy to these forms, ̑ can be generalized in all forms thus yielding a.p. A:, i.e. the pattern sȉlan – sȉlna – sȉlno (which is synchronically identical to a.p.

---

A\textsuperscript{B}; see below). In some cases, this a.p. A: can shift further to a.p. B: or C: (v\jéran or v\jéran – v\jérna – v\jérno). On the other hand, by analogy to s\ilan one can also get s\ilna – s\ilno with the generalized short stem.

The lengthening occurs, of course, in polysyllabic adjectives as well, after which a retraction to the initial stem (even across several syllables) ensues. Cf. sam\òvoljan ‘self-willed’ – sam\òvoljna (cf. the noun sam\òvolja ‘self will’ for the accent) ⇒ sam\òvoljan (by analogy) – sam\òvoljna > s\ámov\óljan – s\ámov\óljna (cf. also jednostavan > jëdnost\ávan ‘simple’, pun\òk\vran > p\unok\v\vran ‘full blooded’, pun\òpr\vran > p\uño\pr\vran ‘full (e.g. member)’, etc.).\textsuperscript{205} This tendency can be seen in other types of words as well, cf. also talij\ánski / talij\ánski > t\álij\ánski ‘Italian’, odust\áo / odüst\áo > od\úst\á / od\úst\á > òdst\á ‘gave up’\textsuperscript{206}, etc. Nevertheless, although this new generalized length does indeed have a role in this process, such a shift occurs even in adjectives with no -RC-, such as razn\òvr\st\án > r\áznov\rst\án ‘miscellaneous’, pun\ò\l\jet\án > p\únol\jet\án ‘of age’, etc. This is a result of a younger (in some cases very recent but not completely clear) tendency for the stress to shift from the connector -ô\textsuperscript{207} to the initial syllable of the word, not only in adjectives but also in nouns, cf. also sam\òvolja > younger s\ámov\olja. Such a shift (or sort of a ‘metatony’ in Neo-Štokavian) can occur in disyllabic root forms such as ùmor\án ‘tired’ (cf. ùmor ‘tiredness’) ⇒ ùm\ór\án > ùm\ór\án as well.\textsuperscript{208}

Secondarily, a.p. A can shift to a.p. C (or B) in some dialects in all or some adjectives. This shift occurs only in the adjectives with ” on the first syllable, thus č\úd\án – č\úd\n – č\úd\no (A) shifts to č\úd\án – č\úd\n – č\úd\no

\textsuperscript{205} In some adjectives, the older accent is rare or completely disappears, cf. z\ádov\óljan ‘satisfied’ (the older accent would be zadov\óljan) but frequent döv\óljan next to younger döv\óljan ‘sufficient’. In dialects with strong synchronic a.p. C, secondary f. forms like zadov\óljna can appear (cf. in Posavina, I vši č 1913 2, 170).

\textsuperscript{206} This occurs in all -ao l-participles. In some dialects, like in Dubrovnik (zam\òt\á; odüst\áć), there is no retraction at all in this type of cases, in others it occurs only in the masculine form (Prapatnice z\ámot\á but zam\öt\ála – zam\ót\álo), while in others, like often in Posavina, it can analogically spread to all forms (z\ámot\ála – z\ámot\álo by analogy to z\ámot\á), often with older variants (zam\öt\ála and z\ámot\ála).

\textsuperscript{207} Not in the case of -ô- only, cf. also oč\ig\led\á > òč\ig\l\éd\á ‘obvious’ (in ùgle\dan > ùg\l\éd\ándan ‘prestigious, respectable’ the length can be analogical to ùg\l\éd ‘respectability’).

\textsuperscript{208} But cf. also ùg\od\án > ùg\od\án ‘pleasant’ without lengthening (and -RC-).
(C) and žălostan – žălosna – žălosno (A) to žălostan – žalôsna – žălosno (C) ‘sad’ (see below for polysyllabic adjectives). However, in cases like ôbićan – ôbićna – ôbićno (A) ‘usual’ (i.e. adjectives with medial “ or ` in preceding syllable in Neo-Štokavian) there is no change. That is because, logically, the original acute a.p. A ” can be mixed with the a.p. C type initial stress only if it is placed on the first syllable.


In Imotska krajina and Bekija (Šimundić 1971, 127–128, 130), in one group of adjectives a.p. A shifts optionally to a.p. C, e.g. čûdan – čûdna / čûdna, the same in jâdan, vlâžan ‘moist’, etc. This pattern is followed also by kâsan ‘late’, which obviously cannot be a.p. a originally (cf. the vocalism in *kûsъnъ) and the shortened old long vowel a.p. c adj. rȅdan ‘orderly’ (cf. rȇd – rȇda ‘order’) and krip’an. The other group of adjectives has completely shifted to a.p. C: gâdan – gâdna – gâmno, the same in mučan ‘nauseous, painful’, sitan, etc.209 (originally a.p. a) but also močan, sočan (originally a.p. c). As can be seen, the reflex of the original a.p. a is the same as the one of the old short vowel a.p. c with a generalized ”(*sȍčъnъ). Theoretically, +sôčan – +sòčna – +sòčno could be a regular reflex of the old a.p. c, but this is not very likely – the shift to a.p. A and then later A

209 Cf. a similar kind of vacillation in a part of Imotska Krajina (Studenci) as attested by Babić 2008: jâdan – jâdna – jâdno (A), gâdan – gâdna – gâmno (C) and brîžan – brîžna / brîžna – brîžno (A/C).
C is more probable. This new a.p. C is actually a.p. C-B, cf. the variant forms in oblique m/n. cases like gen. sg. gădna and gădna (the latter form is the one we would expect in a.p. B). In some adjectives in Imotska krajina, as well as in other dialects, a secondary lengthening / shortening occurs by which certain adjectives shift from or to a.p. A. Cf. the variant forms: bržan ⇒ bržan ‘caring’ (~ briga ‘care’), kūžan ⇒ kūžan (~ kūga ‘plague’), pòsan ⇒ pòsan (perhaps by analogy to pòst, gen. sg. pòsta ‘fast’), súzan ⇒ súzan ‘full of tears’ (the length cannot be original, cf. *ślęza), as well as grîšan ⇒ grîšan ‘sinful’ (cf. Stand. Croat. grijëh, gen. sg. grijéha, dial. grîj, cf. the shortening also in grêšnîk ‘sinner’, which is also not clear), šcédan ⇒ šcédan ‘frugal’ (cf. Stand. Croat. štédjeti ‘save (e.g. money)’). Cf. also čȃsan – čȃsna / čásna – čȃsno ‘honorable’. Most of these cases, concerning both the secondary lengthening (like in kūžan) and shortening (like in grîšan), are difficult to explain (except for pòsan and čásan). One could assume that this is some kind of analogy to adjectives like glȃsan : glāsan ‘loud’ (not attested by Šimundić) or, with another suffix, vȉtak : vȉtak ‘slim’, which is attested in the dialect and originally is probably a.p. c. Secondary forms like kūžan and grêšan could perhaps cast a shadow of doubt upon the supposition that alternations like glȃsan / glāsan are indeed a result of different levellings after the operation of the ‘One mora law’ and not a case of some hard-to-explain secondary lengthening / shortening. Still, considering that such variants appear mostly in the original a.p. c, where they are easy to explain by the said levellings and since the number of adjectives like glāsan / glȃsan is larger than those of sporadic words like kūžan / kūžan, the ‘One mora law’ explanation looks viable. Secondary lengthenings / shortenings in a.p. A and B can be explained by analogy to the alternations in a.p. C as well as in individual ways – pòstan by analogy to pòst, lâžan ‘false’ instead of lâžan by analogy to lâž ‘lie’, částan instead of čȃstan by analogy to čȃst, brîžan / bržan as a younger derivation,, etc.210


---

210 Explanations like jȃsan ‘clear’ (instead of jȁsan) being analogical to glȃsan, etc. are perhaps not as convincing.
gives only sitnā – sītno, vlažnā – vlāžno, thus also a shift to a.p. C. Baotić for Kostrč (1971, 199) gives only the a.p. C adjectives sītān, pōstān (the same as for adjectives like cīst). However, the sparse data from Ivšić and Baotić is not representative of the whole Posavina. A.p. A can be preserved in Posavina, at least partially. In my data from the village of Slobodnica, a.p. A (with the pattern blātān – blātna – blātno – pl. blātni) is preserved in most of the adjectives: blātān, cūdān, gādān, glāsān, grēšān, jādān, jāsān, mlēdān, skōtna, slōžān, šītētān, sūbān, pōstān, rōsān, sprāsna ‘with young (of sows)’, ždrēbna ‘with young (of mares)’. The accent of def. forms is often old (like cūdnī) but can also be innovative in some adjectives (blatnī). In others, the A > C shift is sometimes attested, cf. vīčān – vīčna – vīčno (the same in sitān, strāšān ‘ugly’ and vlāžān). I also have attestations of two adjectives with a secondary shift to a.p. B’ (slīčān – slīčna – slīčno, the same in sprētān) and to a mixed a.p. B-C (svjēstān – svjēsna – svjēsno, the same in srētān). There is an obvious secondary tendency for a.p. A to shift to a.p. C (and a further tendency for this new a.p. C to shift to a.p. B’). Secondary length can be seen in the adjectives (that have def. forms only in the dial.) lāžnī (with the circumflex from the noun) and kāsnī (with the secondary neo-acute in the def. form). The -RC- length is generalized in adjectives like slāvan – slāvna – slāvno – def. slāvnī (the same in őran, sīlan, vōlan), while this type of pattern shifts to the secondary a.p. B: in žēlān – žēlna – žēlno – def. žēlnī.

Polysyllabic adjectives in -an with “ from the old acute (i.e. the original a.p. a) – rādostan ‘joyful’, žālostan, pāmetan ‘clever’, etc. – are in Štok. either a.p. A (constant “ on the first / root syllable) or a.p. C (mobile stress, i.e. f. forms such as radōsna / žalōsna / pamētna). A.p. C in the old a.p. a adjectives is due to analogy to adjectives like bōlestan ‘sick’ and slōbodan ‘free’ that stem from the original a.p. c (cf. the inherited bolēsna, slobōdna, a.p. C). Usually, all of these adjectives behave in the same manner in Štokavian, i.e. there is no distinction between the old a.p. a and a.p. c (cf. the preservation of the original opposition in Brač / Hvar Čakavian below). In many Štokavian dialects (perhaps in all of them), the present a.p. A in these cases is to be derived from the older generalized a.p. C. Thus, the original *slobōdānā (c) / *pāmētna (a) ⇒ *slobōdnā / *pāmetnā (C) ⇒ *slobōdnā / *pāmetnā (C) or *slōbodnā / *pāmetnā (A, by analogy to forms
with initial stress). Of course, the possibility exists that in some dialects a.p. A was generalized from the beginning, but it seems that as a rule almost all archaic Štokavian dialects exhibit a.p. C in these adjectives. It must be said that a shift to a.p. C by polysyllabic adjectives like žalostan can, it seems, be independent of the shift of disyllabic adjectives (like čudan) to a.p. C since in some dialects the original a.p. A is preserved in disyllabic adjectives but not in polysyllabic where a.p. C is generalized (thus čudna but pametna). This could perhaps be related to the A > C shift in the basic nouns pámět, râdost, žâlóst.


The shift to a.p. C, as said, does not occur in medial “ (i.e. Neo-Štok. on the preceding syllable), i.e. in adjectives like kôristan ‘useful’, žêljezan ‘iron’, etc., which remain in a.p. A.

In Imotska krajina and Bekija (Šimundić 1971, 127–128), cf. *bôlestan – ‘bôlesna / bolèsna – ‘bôlesno with variants in f. form (the same in milosan ‘merciful’, rados(t)an, slobodan, žalostan). For Šaptinovac (Ivšić 1907, 140–141), cf. the type pâmétan – pamétña – pâmêtno (the same in prâvedan ‘just’ and secondary ūmoran). Ivšić (1913 2, 47) gives only bolesnâ / bolèsna (acc. sg. bolèsnu, instr. sg. bolesnõm) for Posavina, and the same for pametnâ / pamétña, radosnâ / radôsna, žalosnâ / žalôsna, slobodnâ / slobôdna. He does not mention the type A in such adjectives in Posavina at all. Still, it can be found today, cf. in Orubica (my data) innovative slôbdân – slôbdona but bôlestân – bolèsna and in Slobodnica (my data) prâvedân – prâvedna – prâvedno and the same in pâmétna, žalosnâ, slôbdona, srâmotnà but bôlestân – bolèsna – bôlesno. As for def. forms, the older accent is preserved in the village name Slobodnâ, while the younger accent is attested in forms like bôlesnî, žalosnî, gen. sg. žalôsnî (Ivšić 1913 2, 50–51), cf. also in Slobodnica (my data) pravêdnî, slobôdnî,

---

211 The accent attested in ARj (and some dialects) is, however, pamêtnica, but this must be secondary.
žalôsnê, etc. In other dialects and in the standard language, the youngest def. forms such as slôbodnê, žâlosnê appear. They are made by analogy to the generalized indef. slôbodan – slôbodna. For Kostrč, Baotić (1979, 201–202) gives variant forms bôlestan – bolèsna / bôlesno – bôlesno (the same in bûnâvân ‘giddy’, gôjâzan ‘fat’, drûževân ‘friendly’, ūmûćan ‘wealthy’, mûcârân ‘swampy’, ôsûrân ‘gruff’, rûdostân, prûjâzan ‘nice’, etc.) with a note that the initially accented forms are more frequent. The type C accent occurs in all adjectives in Prapatnice (Vrgorska krajina): bûlestan – bolèsna – bûlesno – def. bûlesnî, also pamêtna, slobòdna, sramûtna ‘shameful’, žalûsna212 (gen. sg. žalûsnê žènê ‘of a sad woman’, žûlosna čôvika ‘of a sad man’).

ČAKAVIAN (Vrgada)213

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m f n</td>
<td>m f n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gûdan gûdna gûdno</td>
<td>jûdni214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tendencies in Čakavian are more or less in accord with the Štokavian ones. A.p. a yields a.p. A with constant “ on the stem and possible secondary shifts to a.p. C in some adjectives / dialects. As in Štokavian, the old short vowel a.p. c adjectives have shifted to a.p. A (even in bolan). This is a general Štok-Čak-Kajk. tendency in *-ьнъ adjectives to split into those with short vowel stems, i.e. into a.p. A (no matter what their origin is), and those with long vowel stems, i.e. into the accentual types that originate from the PSl. (long) a.p. b and c. However, this tendency is hardly very old since there is still the short vowel a.p. C in Križanić’s language.

In Čakavian, the shortening of the old long vowel a.p. c is seen only in the adjectives bûtan, kûpan and strûsan. It seems as if the number of adjectives with the generalization of the shortened vowels after the operation of the ‘One mora law’ is lower in Čakavian than in Štokavian, i.e. that the generalization of length was a more frequent process in Čakavian, but such a conclusion might just be an outcome of the insufficient knowledge of Čakavian data. On the other hand, the processes having to do with

---

212 These forms are now archaic in the dialect.
214 Jurišić 1966, 83.
lengthening / shortening in front of -RC- and other secondary lengthenings are similar to those in Štokavian.

Hraste (1935, 32–33) in his description of the dialect(s) of Hvar does not mention a.p. A -an adjectives. Among Brusje adjectives in ČDL one finds: brȉžna, čȅdna ‘chaste’, čȕdna, krȉpna, skȍna, etc. The adj. gnȏjnȁ ‘purulent’ is in a.p. C due to generalization of the -RC- length and a following shift to a.p. C. The form kȗžan has the usual secondary (unclear) length (see below). From Pittve on Hvar I have attested just the following forms: šȅstan – šèsna – šèsno ‘pretty’ and jàdan – jàdna – jàdno (one would expect *jàdan – *jàdna – *jàdno). In Vrboska on Hvar (Matković 2004), the forms srȉćan – srȉćna – srȉćno ‘happy’ and lȁstan – lȁsna – lȁsno ‘rested’ are found.215 In žȅjan – žȅjnȁ, žȅjnȍ ‘anxious’, one can see a strange accentual pattern after the pre-resonant lengthening. As the given adjectives clearly show, the old a.p. A is, generally speaking, preserved on Hvar – just as in root adjectives but unlike the more innovative Brač dialect.

On Brač (Šimunović 2009, 44), cf. sȉtan – sȉtna – sȉtno (also ūmídàn ‘wet’, pȍstan, mȑsan, sladokȕsan ‘sweet loving’, zimogrȍzan ‘cold-fearing’, jubopȉtan ‘curious’) and a comment that many of the adjectives of this type have a variant end stress: umidnȁ, mrsnȁ, i.e. the A/C vacillation. However, in the dictionary, Šimunović in cases like čȕdan (def. čȕdni), sȕčan (def. sȕšni), jȁdan, plȁčan ‘crying’, etc. does not note feminine end stress so one can assume that the a.p. A pattern is more frequent here. The original a.p. a has merged with the old short vowel a.p. c, cf. mȍćan, plȍdan ‘fruitful’, kãsan ‘late’.

In gnȏjan – gnȏjnȁ – gnȏjno, it is possible to think of the preservation of the old a.p. c of *gnȕj̆sny, but this could also be a secondary accent from a.p. A – first by introduction of the new ĵ in the n. and f. form in front of -jn-, then by transferring it to the m. form by analogy and then by *gnȏjna yielding younger gnȏjnȁ (as on Hvar). Likewise in the adj. ‘anxious’ (žȅjan – žȅjnȁ – žȅjno) but without the generalization of ĵ in the m. form (cf. the basic forms gnȕj ‘dung’ and žȅja ‘wish’ that may or may not have influenced these adjectives). The other possibility is that the old a.p. c is preserved here – perhaps because of the very pre-resonant length,

215 The example pȕtan – potnȁ – pȕtno may be a short vowel a.p. C archaism.
cf. the preservation of a.p. C in Štok. bōlan, but cf. the Brač form bōlan – bōlna – bōlno with a shift to a.p. A and the generalization of $. But cf. the surely secondary a.p. C in sīlan – sīlnā – sīlno (also in vīran), where first $ from pre-resonant forms is generalized and then the secondary a.p. C forms develop. In the def. forms, the accent remains of the a.p. A type: sīlni, vīrni, unlike the def. forms gōjni, žējni. This might support the hypothesis that a.p. c is preserved in gōjan and žējan. Beside sīlan and vīran, cf. also būran where $ remains in all three forms (in the m. form by analogy, of course). Some of the old a.p. a adjectives experience the complete shift to a.p. C, e.g. smīran – smīrnā – smīrno – def. smīrni ‘meek’ (cf. Štok. smjēran). After the pre-resonant lengthening an unusual levelling occurs in ārān – ārān – ārno, where the process was probably: *A (*ārān – *ārān – *ārno) ⇨ *A: (*ārān – *ārān – *ārno, the generalization of the length) ⇨ *C: (*ārān – *ārān – *ārno, analogy to a.p. C) ⇨ B:-C: ārān – ārān – ārno (the m. form by analogy to the f. form and the appearance of a new mixed accentual pattern). The original a.p. A (this Čak. a.p. A is, of course, not PSl. since there is an *o in the root) can still be seen in the def. ārni. These kinds of mixed synchronic patterns are attested in other adjectives on Brač as well.

We see an interesting accentuation in pōtan – potnā – potnō (def. pōtni, the same in ČDL) ‘sweaty’ (cf. pōt – pōta ‘sweat’, PSl. c), where the origin of this secondary type is not clear (perhaps it is in the influence of adjectives like oštar – oštrā – oštrō ‘sharp’, although the motivation is unclear – cf. also pōtan in a.p. C in Vrboska and B’ on Rab, as on Brač).216 Unlike Štok. svjēstan (with a much less frequent variant svjēstan), cf. the Brač a.p. C: in svōstan – svōsnā – svōsno. Here, the original length from svōsnā and svōstan was preserved and generalized – thus the word remained in a.p. C (the length of the basic form svōst may have helped as well).

One witnesses unclear lengthenings, similar to those in Štokavian, in same kind of adjectives with different variants of generalization and post-lengthening development, cf. sūzan (-a, -o) but suzā – sūzu / suzū (PSl. *slēžъ, a.p. c), brīžan – brīžnā – brīžno (but def. brīžni) and kūžan – kūžnā – kūžno (cf. kūga, see below for the accentual pattern).

216 Cf. the Rab form pōtan – potnā – potnō (Kušar 1894, 34).
On Vrgada (Jurišić 1966, 83; 1973), the largest group of adjectives preserves a.p. A: jȁdan – jȁdna – jȁdno (the same in kȑšan, mȑsan, prȕdan ‘useful’, sȑićan ‘alike’, vlȁžan ‘moist’). These are joined by the old short vowel a.p. c adjectives: drȍban ‘tiny’, pȍtan, kȁsan (def. kasnȋ). An optional shift to a.p. C is attested in sȉtan – sitnȁ / sȉtna – sȉtno (A/C) and a complete one in skȍtan – skotnȁ – skȍtno (C) ‘with young (of animals)’. In resonant ending root adjectives, two different forms of developments from length alternation can be seen: the generalization of a short vowel in all forms as in žȅlàn – žȅlna (-o) or the generalization of ˘ and a shift to a.p. C: vȋran – vȉrnȁ – vȉrno – def. vȉrnī. As on Brač, the adj. svȉstan – svȉšnȁ – svȉšno has a generalized length with the preservation of a.p. C (cf. Štok. svjȅstan A). Unclear secondary lengthening, as elsewhere in Čakavian and Štokavian, is seen in brȉžan (-a, -o).


In Gacka (Kranjčević 2003), cf. the pattern gȁdan – gȁdna – gȁdno – def. gȁdni, the same in blȁtan, jȁdan (unlike Grobnik, Orlec and Orbanići, see below), jȁsan ‘clear’, jȕžan, sȉlan – sȉlna – sȉlno (all a.p. a) with a generalized ˘ from pre-resonant lengthening and bȉtan, kȑpȁn (a.p. c).

In Grobnik (L uke žič Z ubčić 2007, 96–97, 101, 105–106), one finds the following situation. There is an a.p. A with no ˘ in def. forms, as in lȁčān – lȁčna – lȁčno – def. lȁčnī ‘hungry’ and also in čȗdān, sȉtān, sȑićān, slȍžān, srȉćān, zlȍbān, etc. This pattern is found also in polysyllables podȍbān,217 zadovȍjān (zadovȍjna, zadovȍjno – def. zadovȍjni). In other group of polysyllabic adjectives the neo-circumflex appears: korȉstan – korȉsna – korȉsno – def. korȉsnī (also in pobȍžān ‘religious’, siromȃšān ‘poor’). In a.p. A, together with the old a.p. a adjectives, there are also old short vowel a.p. c adjectives such as drȍbān – drȍbna – drȍbno (drȍbnī), mȕčān, plȍdān, vȍdān ‘watery’, žȅjān (žȅjna – žȅjno), etc., as well as the shortened old long vowel adj. kȑpȁn. Some adjectives shifted to a.p. C, cf. blȁtān – blȁtnā – blȁtno – def. blȁtnī (pȍtān is also C). The adjective

---

217 There is only podȍbnī attested as the def. form but also spodȍbnī in the same meaning (‘alike’).
Historical development of adjective accentuation in Croatian...


In Rijeka (Strohal 1894, 159), cf. blȃtan, cȕdan, lȁćan, sîlan, slāvan, vȅran for a.p. A. A.p. A consists of the old short vowel a.p. c adjectives (drȍban, bȍlan – +bȏlna) and the shortened old long vowel a.p. c adjectives (strȃsan). As elsewhere, the adj. brȋzan is lengthened.

In Orlec (Houtzagers 1985), cf. a.p. A in blȃten, lȁćen – lȃšni, müčen – müšni. The adj. brȋžni has only def. forms that point to the indef. *brȋžen (with the usual unclear lengthening) that no longer exists. The adj. pȕten – potnâ does not show if it is a.p. B or C. The adjective bȏlen – bolnâ – bolnȕ – pl. bolnȉ is in a.p. B. The adj. jȃden – jadnâ – jȃdni is in a.p. C:, as in Grobnik and Orbanići. The number of adjectives is too small for any general conclusions.

In Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998, 143–144), cf. the preserved a.p. A in the type srȅćan – srȅćna – srȅćno (the same in blȃtan, lȁćan, müćan, nom. pl. f. sȁtne, nom. pl. m. slȕžni). These adjectives are joined by the old short vowel a.p. c: drȍban – drȍbna – drȍbno, the same in pȕtan, plȕdna. Cf. also bȏlen – b̥ dolna – b̥ dolno and žȅlān – žȅlna – žȅlno with a shift to a.p. A as well but with the pre-resonant lengthening. The adverb bȉtno shows the shortening of the old a.p. c and the adj. jȃdan – jȃdnâ / jȃdna – jȃdni is in a.p. C: as elsewhere in the North. The unclear lengthening is seen in brȋžan – brȋžna – brȋžno. Of course, here it might be due to analogy to the old neo-circumflex in def. forms. For kȃsan see above.

As for the polysyllabic adjectives of the original a.p. a with a ‘ on the first syllable (which are mixed with the polysyllabic adj. of the original a.p. c with a ‘ on the first syllable), cf. the levelled Vrgada (Jurišić 1973) žȁlosan, pȃmetan ‘clever’ and bȕlestan, slȕbdan all in a.p. A, Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007) slȕbdan – slȕbdano – slȕbdno (same for pȃmetân), Orlec (Houtzagers 1985) pȃmeten – pȃmetno, žȁlosen – žȁlosno ‘sad’ and Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998) pȃmetna, žȁlosan – žȁlosna, slȕbdano – slȕbdno. At least in some of these dialects, a.p. A could be a result of the older generalization directly to a.p. A and not from the older earlier overall generalization of a.p. C, mentioned in the section on Štokavian (see
above). However, unlike Štokavian, the original opposition is partially preserved in some Čakavian dialects. Cf. on Brač (ČDL; Šimunović 2009), a.p. A in pãmetan, žãlostan, prãvedan ‘just’, rãdostan ‘joyful’ (all originally a.p. a) but also secondarily in pãkostan ‘spiteful’ and ŏbločan ‘cloudy’ (originally a.p. c) vs. the preserved a.p. C in slõbodan – slobolnã – slõbolno and bõlestan – bolesnã – bolesnõ (with the neuter accent by analogy to the feminine form). Such a distinction is supported by my data from Pitve on Hvar: pãmetan – pãmetna – pãmetno, rãdosan – rãdosna – rãdosno, žãlosna – žãlosni (A) but bõlestan – bolesnã – bõlesnõ – pl. bõlesni – bõlesne (C).

KAJKAVIAN (Ozalj)\(^{220}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vȅrən</td>
<td>+vȅrna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Kajkavian, the most frequent reflex of a.p. a is a.p. A (which can secondarily shift to a.p. C), i.e. the constant “ in indef. forms and ^ in def. ones (if the neo-circumflex is not secondarily replaced by ”). This pattern, beside the original a.p. a adjectives, consists of the old short vowel a.p. c (like *pȍtьnъ) and the shortened old long vowel a.p. c (like *gȏlsьnъ). The tendency of all adjectives with short and shortened roots to shift to a.p. A (regardless of the original a.p.) and only long vowel adjectives to remain in a.p. B and C is present in Kajkavian as well, just like in Štokavian / Čakavian.

In some dialects, the length from the forms with a closed syllable can spread to all forms. In Kajkavian (and in Slovene), the old acute lengthens to ^ in front of every -CC- (not just -RC- as in most Štok/Čak. dialects) where the old yer was dropped. The alternation of “ : ^ type like *srȅčen –

\(^{218}\) Since this accent is attested in both ČDL and Šimunović 2009, this is surely not a mistake.

\(^{219}\) According to Domagoj Vidović (p.c.) in Pučišća on Brač pãmetan, rãdostan, slõbodan and bõlestan are in a.p. A/C (i.e. there is vacillation), while žãlostan and ŏbločan are just a.p. A. Here, the old types have merged even though the results are not the same for all words.

\(^{220}\) Težak 1981, 270.
*srčna – *srčno would be expected in all old a.p. a adjectives, but what one finds in Kajkavian is just the type *srčen – *srčna – *srčno with a generalized “ by analogy to probably not just nom. sg. m. but to adjectives with “ in all indef. forms, i.e. those that have “ not from the old acute but from the old short (like *pötěn – *pötno, and *pötna by analogy) or long circumflex (like *gläsno and *gläsen, *gläsna by analogy).

In Velika Rakovica (March 1981, 265–266), the type A (sjäjen – def. sjäjni ‘bright’) consists of: vȅren, smȅren, polysyllabic želȅzen, etc. and sjäjen (the shortened a.p. c?). There is also a type C (probably of secondary origin from the older *A type) connected with the type A: gläsen – +glasnā – +gläsno – def. +gläsni. This a.p. C consists of:

a) the original a.p. a adjectives: kmȉčen ‘dark’, plȁšen ‘timid’, srȅčen, sȇten
b) the adj. tȅmen ‘dark’ (PSL. b)
c) the original short vowel a.p. c adjectives: pȍten, rȍsen ‘dewy’, sȇčen
d) the original long vowel a.p. c adjectives: glȁsen, mȁsten (cf. mástȅn in Varaždin but mástȇn in Turopolje), strȁšen ‘terrifying’ (the vowel is shortened in skȑben as well)


In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002), a.p. A (i.e. “ on the stem – f. and n. are irrelevant due to the retraction, cf. nȍga < *nogȃ ‘leg’) consists of:

a) the original a.p. a adjectives: blȁtȩn, čȇdȩn, gȃdȩn (comp. gȃdněši), jȁdȩn (comp. jȁdněši), jȃsȩn, poblȇȣȩn, sȉtȩn (comp. sȉtnȩši), sklȃdȩn ‘balanced’ (comp. sklȃdǹśi), sȑičȩn (comp. sȑičnȩši), smrȜtȩn ‘mortal’, sprȅtȩn ‘skilful’ (but comp. sprȇtnȩši), srȅčen (comp. srȅčnȩši), def.
svilni ‘silk’, vèrèn (comp. vèrnèši), vìčen ‘used to’, vlàžen, vòlen ‘willing’, zlòben (comp. zlòbnèši);
b) the original a.p. a adjectives ⇒ a.p. A: (by analogy to the -CC- and perhaps def. forms): cèđen, kùžen, sìlen, smèrèn (cf. Štok. younger smjèran, sìlan);
c) the original short vowel a.p. c: kèsèn (comp. kèsnèši), mòčèn (comp. mochnèši), ròsèn (but comp. rònèši), def. skòtnì, sòčèn, tròsèn ‘decrepit’ (but comp. trònèši), zèlèn;
d) the original long vowel a.p. c: glàsèn (comp. glasnèši), gnùsen ‘awful’ (but with a secondary comp. gnùsnèši), màstèn (comp. masnèši), rèđèn, slàstèn, vèčèn, zràčèn.

The distinction between a.p. A < a.p. a and a.p. A < a.p. c is apparent in
the comparative form although the opposition is not perfect, cf. jàdnèši (a)
but glasnèši (c). This pattern is confirmed by *-ъkъ adjectives as well (see
below).

In Turopolje (Šojat 1982, 400), cf. srèčèn, mèčèn ‘quick, expeditious’,
sprètèn for a.p. A.

Valjavec (1894, 226–228) gives the following a.p. A adjectives for
Kajkavian:
a) the original a.p. a adjectives: blàten, cèđen, cùden, jàden, jàsen,
làčèn, mùčèn, sìlen, sìtèn, vèrèn, vlàžèn, zlòben (the adj. slàven has a
generalized length from the -CC- forms);\footnote{The f. and n. form are unusual: kèsna – kèsno.}
b) the original short vowel a.p. c adjectives: bòžèn, càsèn, dròbèn,
kèsen, mòčèn, plòdèn, ròdèn, znòjèn, zèlèn;
c) the original long vowel a.p. c adjectives: vèčèn, glàsèn (cf. Štok.
vjèčan and glàsan / glásan).

The adj. tèmen (and tèmen, f. tèmna, PSl. b) and originally short vowel
adj. gròzen / gròzen and òren are in this group as well.

sg. m. is found in:

\footnote{It is interesting that in Kajkavian the generalization of \‘ occurs almost in the
very same examples as in Štokavian (slàven, vèrèn, smèrèn), i.e. in front of -RC-, in
spite of the fact that Kajkavian lengthening is not limited to pre-RC- positions only
(after the loss of the yers) but occurs in front of any -CC- group. Perhaps this is just
a coincidence.}
a) the original a.p. a adjectives: blȁtan, mȕčan, sȕćan, slȕžan, srȅćan
(together with two adj. with the generalized -CC- length: sȉtan, vȅran);

b) the original short vowel a.p. c adjectives: trȅšan ‘decrepit’, drȅban ‘tiny’, kȅsen;

c) the original long vowel a.p. c adjectives: vȅčan, glȁsan, skȑban (?).

The adj. tȅman (PSl. b) is here as well, while the adj. jãdan, lãčan belong to another type. For polysyllabic adjectives, cf. (s)pȏmetan and spomȅtan (-a, -o) ‘clever’, slȕbodan, ôblačan.

In Ozalj (Težak 1981, 268, 270–271), there are three accentual patterns among adjectives that have “ at least in some of the indef. forms:

I) the type svȉlən – svȉlna – svȉlni – def. svȉlni and the same in smȇrən and vȅrən except for the variant def. forms smȇrni and +vȇrni. The shortened stem adj. sjȁjən and strȁšən are also here.

II) the type C.: glȁsən – +glásna – +glȁsno – def. +glȁsni. This is a pattern with the length in the def. forms that consists of:
a) the original a.p. a adjectives: bȕčən, plȁšən, srȉćən;
b) the original short vowel a.p. c: kȁsən, rȍsən (secondarily), trȇšən (+ tȁmən, PSl. b);

III) the type C: rȍsən – rósna – rȍsno – def. rȍsni. This type consists of:
a) the original a.p. a: kmȉčən, sȉtən;
b) the original short vowel a.p. c: pȍtən, rösən (secondarily also in C.), sȍčən.

The only distinction of a.p. C. and a.p. C is in def. forms (+glȃsni : rȍsni). The Ozalj indef. f. form glásna can be derived from both *glȃsnā and *glasnā, although the def. forms show that the length was preserved up to a point (of course, the very form *glȃsna is secondary, i.e. made by analogy to a.p. b).

In the 17th century dialect of Križanić, the synchronic a.p. A, like in Cȗlen – cûlna – sîlno, Tájen / Tâjen – májna – táino / tâino ‘secret’, wéren – wȅrña – wȅrno (cf. also Clâven – slâwno, the form slȃwna [slāvnâ]

---

223 * can also be the result of the analogy to the def. forms.
is probably an error), was, it seems, still different from the synchronic short vowel a.p. C type (from the old short vowel a.p. c) found in adjectives like čésten – Czestná (but also чéстна) – czéstno ‘honorable’, гóden – godná – гóдно (cf. Ослон 2011, 123). As opposed to -an adjectives, where Križanić’s dialect preserves a.p. A, in -ak adjectives a.p. A shifts to a.p. C.

**a.p. A:** b’itan important (also C:, cf. б’ит – b’iti essence), 224 bl'atan muddy (cf. блaто mud), br’izan attentive (> A:, cf. бр’иза ‘concern’, a loanword from Italian), b'úran turbulent (< *A, cf. б’ит – b’iti essence), č'astan honorable (> A:, PSl. c, cf. чaсть honor, Križanić C), ě’edan virgin, chaste, є’em’eran sorrowful (and є’ем’еран, cf. є’ем’ер sorrow, pain), є’udan strange (cf. є’удо miracle), dr'oban tiny (PSl. c), g’adan awful (cf. г’ад – g’ada bastard), gn’ojan purulent (> A:, and C:, PSl. c, cf. gnój – gn’оja dung), h’ulan unrespectful (> A:, cf. х’улии be unrespectful / ungrateful), j’adan poor (also C:, cf. jяд – j’ада226 misery), j’asan clear (> C:), 227 k’asan late (PSl. b?, cf. k’аснити be late > *къснити), k’išan rainy (cf. k’ишa rain), k’ršan strong (cf. k’рс – k’рса karst), kr’ěpan brisk (PSl. c 228), k’užan contagious (> A:, cf. к’уза plague), l’acan hungry, l’agodan easygoing, l’astan easy (also B:/C:), l’ažan false (> A:, cf. л’аз – л’ази lie), m’očan powerful (PSl. c, cf. м’оч – м’оци power), ’oran willing (> A:), p’ametan clever (> C, cf. pаметовати try / pretend to be smart), pl’ačan crying (cf. пл’ач – пл’ача crying), pl’odan fertile (PSl. c, cf. плóд – плóда fruit), por’očan prone to vice (cf. пор’ок vice), p’ostan fast (> A:, cf. p’ост – p’оста fast day), p’otan sweaty, p’ozdan late, pr’avedan fair (> C, cf. пр’авъ right), r’adostan cheerful (> C, cf. рад’овати be cheerful), r’odan fertile (PSl. c, cf. р’од – р’ода kin), r’osan

---

224 It is possible that bitan is a newer and literary word (cf. the attestations in ARj) and, as such, irrelevant for accentological purposes. However, today it does occur in dialects as well.

225 Also х’улии.

226 Also j’ад – j’ада (and an a.p. c adjective in accordance with this variant).


228 Cf. the reconstructed a.p. c for *крěпъкъ and *крěпъ in Дыбo 1981, 104–105 and also Slovene krepím, Czech krepiti (with a short vowel) for a.p. c. A.p. B: in Pos-avina (Siče: pokрěпímo, Magić Mala: крěпи) is secondary – this is one of the PSl. a.p. c verbs that shift to a.p. B: in Siče and Magić Mala (cf. Кapović 2011c).
dewy (PSl. c, cf. ròsa – rȍsu dew), s’ëtan mospish (cf. sjȅta downcast), s’ilan forceful (> A:, cf. sȉla force), sirom’ašan poor (cf. siròmašiti 229 get poor), s’ïtan tiny, skl’adan symmetrical (cf. sklȃd – sklȁda harmony), sk’otan with young (of animals) (cf. skòt – skòta spawn), sk’roman humble (a loanword from Czech), s’ěstan gentle (cf. sjȅta downcast), s’ilan alike (cf. sȉka picture), s’ilan forceful (> A:, cf. sȉla force), sirom’ašan poor (cf. siròmašiti 229 get poor), s’itan tiny, skl’adan symmetrical (cf. sklȁd – sklȁda harmony), sk’otan with young (of animals) (cf. skòt – skòta spawn), sk’roman humble (a loanword from Czech), s’ëtan gentle (cf. sjȅta downcast), s’ilan alike (cf. sȉka picture), s’ilan forceful (> A:, cf. sȉla force), sirom’ašan poor (cf. siròmašiti 229 get poor), s’itan tiny, skl’adan symmetrical (cf. sklȁd – sklȁda harmony), sk’otan with young (of animals) (cf. skòt – skòta spawn), sk’roman humble (a loanword from Czech), s’ëstan gentle (cf. sjȅta downcast), s’ilan alike (cf. sȉka picture), s’ilan forceful (> A:, cf. sȉla force), sirom’ašan poor (cf. siròmašiti 229 get poor), s’itan tiny, skl’adan symmetrical (cf. sklȁd – sklȁda harmony), sk’otan with young (of animals) (cf. skòt – skòta spawn), sk’roman humble (a loanword from Czech), s’ëstan gentle (cf. sjȅta downcast), s’ilan alike (cf. sȉka picture), s’ilan forceful (> A:, cf. sȉla force), sirom’ašan poor (cf. siròmašiti 229 get poor), s’ivan famous (> A:, cf. slȁva fame), s’l’idan tiny, skl’adan symmetrical (cf. sklȁd – sklȁda harmony), sk’otan with young (of animals) (cf. skòt – skòta spawn), sk’roman humble (a loanword from Czech), s’ëstan gentle (cf. sjȅta downcast), s’ilan alike (cf. sȉka picture), s’ilan forceful (> A:, cf. sȉla force), sirom’ašan poor (cf. siròmašiti 229 get poor), s’itan tiny, skl’adan symmetrical (cf. sklȁd – sklȁda harmony), sk’otan with young (of animals) (cf. skòt – skòta spawn), sk’roman humble (a loanword from Czech), s’ëstan gentle (cf. sjȅta downcast), s’ilan alike (cf. sȉka picture), s’ilan forceful (> A:, cf. sȉla force), sirom’ašan poor (cf. siròmašiti 229 get poor), s’olan mortal (cf. smȑt – smȑti death), s’očan juice, s’pun capable (> sp’osoban), spr’asna with young (of sows)230 (PSl. c, cf. pràse, Siče se prasȋ 231), spr’etan skilful, s’rdā čan cordial (also srd’ačan), sr’ěstan happy (cf. srȅsti meet, srȅća luck), st’ālan constant (< *A), s’uzan tearful (> A:, PSl. c, cf. sùza – sȕzu tear), sv’ēstan aware (also C:, cf. svijȇst – svijȇsti awareness), sv’ilan silky (but cf. svila – svilu silk),232 št’etan harmful (cf. štěta harm), tr’ošan decrepit (cf. trȍšiti spend), t’uroban gloomy, ug’odan comfortable (> ‘ugodan),233 un’oran tired (> A: > ‘umōran, cf. ĭmor tiredness), v’ičan eternal (also A: > B:/C:, PSl. c, cf. vijȇk – vijȇka age), v’ēran faithful (> A: > B:/C:, cf. vjȅra faith), v’ičan adept, vl’ažan moist (cf. vlȁga moist), v’odan watery (PSl. c, cf. vòda – vȍdu water), v’oljan willing (> A:, cf. vòlja will), zāv’idan envious, zl’iban mean (cf. zlȇba spite), zn’ojan sweaty (> A:, cf. znȇj – znȇja sweat), ž’alostan sad (> C, cf. žȁliti mourn, be sorry), ždr’ěbna with young (of mares) (PSl. c, cf. ždrijȇbe foal, Siče se ždrebĩ), žel’ëzan iron (cf. žèljezo iron), ž’eljan desirous (> A: > B:/C:, and C, PSl. c, cf. žèlja – žȅlju wish)

229 The noun siròmāh (B) is secondary.
230 Cf. ARj and Slobodnica sprᾲsna for the accent.
231 The Posavian villages of Siče and Magić Mala preserve an archaic i-verb system without many changes that have occurred in other Štok/Čak. dialects (for instance prası instead of the innovative prãsī). This is why their verbal a.p. can help in the reconstruction of the related original adjectival a.p. (for instance, prası in Siče and the noun prāse point to the original a.p. c for the adj. *porsьnъ as well). For the i-verbs, see more in Kapović 2011c.
232 Adjectival a.p. A is unclear.
233 Cf. the noun ĭgoda.
234 Cf. viječan in Vuk, ARj and Daničić 1872, 94.
2. a.p. b

**Proto-Slavic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short vowel</th>
<th>Long vowel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>тъмьнъ</em></td>
<td><em>кръсънъ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>тъмнънъ</em></td>
<td><em>кроиънъ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>тъмнъно</em></td>
<td><em>кроиъно</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indefinite adjectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>тъмънъ</em></td>
<td><em>тъмънънъ</em></td>
<td><em>тъмънъно</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definite adjectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>тъмънънъ</em></td>
<td><em>тъмънънънъ</em></td>
<td><em>тъмънънъно</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>тъмънънънъ</em></td>
<td><em>тъмънънънънъ</em></td>
<td><em>тъмънънънъно</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Proto-Slavic, the adjectives of the immobile non-acute a.p. had the stress on the first syllable: *кръсънъ* – *кръсънънъ* – *кръсънъно*. After the operation of Dybo’s law, one gets *кръсънъ* – *кръсънънъ* – *кръсънъно* with a constant post-stem stress. When the *yers* begin to weaken, the form *кръсънъ* remains unchanged because the *yer* there is in strong position (in front of another *yer* in the following syllable). In two of the other forms, the stress is retracted (by Ivšić’s law) to the root: *кръсънънъ* > *кръсънънънъ* and *кръсънъно* > *кръсънъно* (the alternative being that there was no Dybo’s law stress shift to the *yers* to begin with). For such a reconstruction, cf. Дыбо 1981, 94. *-ънъ* (and *-ъкъ*) adjectives had suffixes beginning with *yers* and this fact yielded an accentual mobility of some sort in a.p. b, since the stress in the m. form differed from those in the f. and n. form due to the morphonological structure of the suffixes in question. This could have caused an early restructuring of the original accentual type. Thus, in Old Russian (Дыбо 1981, 72) the original pattern is remodeled to a younger one: гръшънъ – гръшнънъ – гръшнъно (cf. the Štok. type тужан – тужна – тужно), where the f. and n. form get the desinential stress by analogy to the m. form (after the fall of the final *yer*) and the usual accentual pattern elsewhere in a.p. b (cf. e.g. the type *дебелъ* – *дебелънъ* – *дебелъно* ‘fat’).

---

235 In the m. form, the *yer* is in strong and in the f. and n. forms in weak position, which means that the latter have a neo-acute on the stem (cf. *съдъ* and gen. sg. *съдънъ* ‘court’).
Štokavian

Short vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m táman 236</td>
<td>m tâmnī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f támna</td>
<td>f tâmnā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n tâmno</td>
<td>n tâmnō</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Long vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m krȃsan</td>
<td>m krâsnī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f krȃsna</td>
<td>f krâsnā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n krâsno</td>
<td>n krâsnō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m túžan</td>
<td>m tȗžnī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f túžna</td>
<td>f túžnā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n túžno</td>
<td>n túžnō</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reflexes of the old a.p. b in Štokavian are just long vowel stems. The reason for that is the low number of short vowel a.p. b adjectives in the first place (the only one to reflect in Croat. being *tьmь ̀nъ) but also because, as already mentioned, all adjectives with a short or shortened stem merged with a.p. a, i.e. shifted to a.p. A. A similar situation exists in the suffixless adjectives where only long vowel adjectives remain in a.p. B and C (with the exception of gol and bos in many dialects). In tokavian, the originally short vowel adj. táman has length due to -mn- but also perhaps due to the secondary length in the basic noun tâma.

The PSl. a.p. b is succeeded in tokavian by two accentual types: a.p. A:B:237 (like krȃsan < krȃsan) and a.p. B: (like túžan < tȗžnъ sad), between which, of course, there are many overlaps. The krȃsan type is formed by generalization of the PSl. accent from the forms *krâsьna and *krâsьno. By analogy to krȃsna and krȃsno one gets krȃsan as well, while the tȗžnъ type is formed by generalization of the accent from the form *krâsьnъ. Thus, by analogy to tȗžnъ one also gets tȗžnā, tȗžnō. The expected reflexes *krâsān – *krâsna – *krâsno break into two different patterns with local discrepancies.

---

236 This example is not very good but there are only a few old short vowel a.p. b adjectives. The length is generalized from the forms with pre-resonant lengthening in front of -mn-. The secondary length in the basic noun táma (older tmâ) < *tьmâ is probably due to the influence of the adjective, although there are other examples of such lengthenings in nouns, cf. Stand. Croat. stâblo instead of the older stâblo (e.g. in Dubrovnik) < *stȣblò.

237 The sign b means that the a.p. in question is derived from a.p. B even though it is not a.p. B anymore (but a.p. A:).
in the exact grouping of specific adjectives. An additional problem is the disappearance of the old a.p. c adjectives in some dialects, which means that the original pattern glâdan – gládna – gládno may also yield a.p. B: (glâdan – gládna – gládno). Furthermore, in Neo-Štokavian the type A\textsuperscript{B}: (krâsan) merges with the type A: (slâvan – with the generalization of ́ by analogy to the forms with -RC-, see above). The distinction, however, is preserved in Slavonian Old Štokavian (krâsan : slâvan).

In classical literary Štokavian (where there is no special a.p. C:, which has merged with a.p. B:, as in suffixless adjectives – thus gládno instead of glâdno), there are two accentual types (cf. e.g. Matešić 1970, 170, 173):

I) a.p. B: (búdan – búdna – búdno awake), which consists of:
   a) the original long a.p. b: rávan flat, smijéšan funny, vrijédan worthy, tûžan sad, etc.;
   b) the original long a.p. c: bijéšan, glâdan, zlátan gold, etc.;

II) a.p. A: (dîvan – dîvna – dîvno), which consists of:
   a) original a.p. a adjectives with the generalized length from the -RC- forms: bûran turbulent, vjérân, sîlan, etc.;
   b) original a.p. b adjectives: dîčan proud, jâvan public, kîvan bitter, krâsan, etc.;\textsuperscript{238}
   c) original short a.p. c adjectives with the generalized length from the -RC- forms: znôjan, gnôjan, žêljjan, etc.;
   d) some original long vowel a.p. c adjectives: srâman shy, skřban caring, etc.

There is a great deal of overlap and variant forms in these two types, of course. Cf. e.g. zlátan (B:) and zlâtan (A:), kvâran (B:) and kvâran (A:), gnjévan (B:) and gnjévan (A:). As already said, the expected *díčan – *díčna – *díčno yield the types dîčan – dîčna – dîčno and dîčan – dîčna – dîčno, which then mixes with the secondary type žêljjan – žêljna – žêljno (from the old short vowel a.p. c or a.p. a) and with the type gládan – gládna – gládno, where ́ was generalized by analogy to the f. form and the type túžan – túžna – túžno instead of the original glâdan – gládna – gládno. The unclear shortening of the old a.p. b is seen in grêšan (next to the variant grijêšan, which is rare today).\textsuperscript{239}

\textsuperscript{238} For a list of such adjectives, cf. also Daničić 1872, 94.
\textsuperscript{239} Cf. also the unexpected shortening in the noun grêšnîk ‘sinner’.
In Imotska krajina and Bekija (Šimundić 1971, 128, 130–32), the situation is quite complicated due to many variant forms and levellings.\(^{240}\) There are four accentual types there that are connected to a.p. \(b\):

I) a.p. B: \((\text{miran} – \text{mirna} – \text{mirno} \text{ peaceful})\) with only two adjectives: \(\text{miran}\) and \(\text{vridan}\);

II) a.p. A:/A:-B: \((\text{sjȃjan} – \text{sjȃjna} / \text{sjajna} – \text{sjȃjno} / \text{sjȃjno})\) – only \(\text{sjȃjan}\) and \(\text{tȗžan}\);

III) a.p. C:/B: \((\text{dȋčan} – \text{dȋčna} – \text{dȋčno}, \text{gen. sg. dȋčna / dȋčna}, \text{dat. sg. dȋčnu / dȋčnu, etc.})\), which consists of:

   a) the original a.p. \(a\) adjectives with the generalized -RC- length: \(\text{smiran, viran}\);

   b) the original long a.p. \(b\): \(\text{díčan, grdan, krupan} \text{ large, mličan} \text{ milky, mrsan} \text{ (and A:/C:)}, \text{snažan, stidan, žedan, žudan} (+ \text{tavan} \text{‘dark’}, PSl. short vowel a.p. \(b\));

   c) the original short vowel a.p. \(c\) adjectives with the generalized length from the -RC- forms: \(\text{bolan, gojan}\);

   d) the original long vowel a.p. \(c\) adj.: \(\text{bisan} \text{ furious, gladan, masan} \text{ greasy, slasan}\);

IV) a.p. A:/C: \((\text{čȃsan} – \text{čȃsna} / \text{čásna} – \text{čȃsno})\), which consists of:

   a) the original a.p. \(a\) adjectives with the generalized length from the -RC- forms: \(\text{slavan, voljan}\);

   b) the original a.p. \(b\) adjectives: \(\text{divan, mrsan} \text{ (also C:/B:)}, \text{ravan}\);

   c) the original short vowel a.p. \(c\) adjectives with secondary length: \(\text{čȃsan} \text{ honorable.}\)

Here, numerous analogies have led to the formation of various secondary accentual types with many variant forms. This means that there is no clear a.p. \(B\), a.p. \(A^B\) and a.p. \(C\): – everything is mixed. These original types were joined by the adjectives of the original a.p. \(a\) with the generalized length

---

\(^{240}\) A precautionary note is in order. It is not certain whether such a system is a real description of the situation on the field in many or most of the local dialects there or if it is a result of Šimundić’s methodology of describing the accentual system of the whole area at the same time, while in fact trying to describe numerous different local dialects that are close but not identical. It can very well be that the situation in specific local dialects might not be so complicated and might be more archaic than the impression one may get from Šimundić’s description.
from the -RC- forms as well as by the originally short vowel adjectives that got some kind of secondary length like čȃsan. For the originally a.p. b adjectives grȋšan and šćȇdan ‘thrifty’ one finds the unclear shortened variants grȋšan and šćȇdan as well.

In Prapatnice in Vrgorska krajina (my data), the situation is as follows. A.p. B: is found in just a couple of adjectives from the old(er) a.p. b: míran – mírna – mírno – def. mȋrnī / mìrnī (this in relation to Štok. mȋr B:), the same for dúžan, mrȃčan, rávan, stȋdan (gen. sg. stȋdna and def. stȋdnī). Some of the original a.p. c adjectives have shifted to a.p. B: (see below). A.p. B:-C: is found in vrîdan (gen. sg. vrîdna) – vrîdna – vrîndo – def. gen. sg. vrîdnōga and the same in kîvan and rûžan (but def. rûžnī). As for the other adjectives of the old a.p. b, there is shortening in grȋšan (gen. sg. grȋšna) – grȋšna – grȋšno (and a shift to a.p. A > C), and others shift to a.p. C: bȋdan – bȋdna – bȋdno – def. bȋdnī, the same in gȑdan (def. gȑdnē ženē of the nasty woman), krȗpan (def. krȗpnī), mlȃčan lukewarm, mȓsan (def. mȓsnē rȁnē of the greasy food), mȗtan blurred (def. mȗtnō / mȗtnō), prȃzan (def. prȂznī / prȂznī), prȉsan raw (def. prȉsn ā pȇgaĉa), smȋšan funny (def. smȋsnī), trȋzan sober (def. trȉznī / trȋznī), žȇdan (def. žȅdnī). As we can see, few of the old a.p. b adjectives have remained in a.p. B:, while the majority shifted, partially or completely, to a.p. C. As in Imotska krajina, this is also part of the general tendency of a.p. C to prevail in these dialects.

Rešetar (1900, 115, 118) gives the following data for his southwest tokavian dialects. A.p. B: in Dubrovnik is attested only in míran (like in Imotska and Vrgorska krajina, the old a.p. c), dúžan ‘in debts’ and lásan. All other adjectives, it seems, belong to a.p. C: – e.g. prazan, žedan and smȉješan (which are a.p. B: elsewhere) and the same is for all adj. that are A:B: as dȋvan elsewhere. In Dubrovnik, the expected type *dívan – *dȋvna – *dȋvno is disposed of by changing *dívan to *dȋvan by analogy to *glȃdan.

In Ozrinići and Prćanj, Rešetar attests the type tȗžan – tȗžna – tȗžno, in which all old patterns are merged:

a) adjectives that are A:B: elsewhere – grdan, griješan, dičan, kivan, krasan, trudan;

241 In Štokavian, the noun mȋr is often a.p. B: (gen. sg. mȋra) so one might expect míran (B:) to be in accord with that. However, the basic noun is a.p. C: (gen. sg. mȋra) in Dubrovnik (mȋr in a.p. B: is a Roman loanword meaning ‘wall’, cf. Latin mūrus).
b) adjectives that are B: elsewhere – dužan, miran, mutan, prazan, žêdan;
c) the adj. slavan (the old a.p. a with the generalized ~ from the -RC-forms);
d) the old a.p. c – gladan, zlatan, strašan terrifying.

The only oxytonic adj. is růžân – růžnȁ – rûžnȍ. In Ozrinići (Rešetar 1900, 117), the adj. dȉman – dȉmna – dȉmno ‘wonderful’ (with -mn- < -vn-) is also attested, where ~ is probably due to misinterpretation of ~ in front of -mn- as a positional preresonant length, which led to the formation of dȉman as opposed to *dȋmna just like sȉlan is opposed to sîlna (then ~ is generalized in the other two forms as well).

In Southern Baranja, according to Sekereš (1977, 389), there is only a.p. B:, both from the old a.p. b (krúpan, rávan) and the old a.p. c (bísan, gládan, ládan cold), although the data is scarce. For Šaptinovac, Ivšić (1907, 140, 142) gives only a.p. C: – the adjectives are mostly from the original a.p. c (like ládan, etc.) but also rûžan – rûžna – rûžno and žêdan. For Posavina in general, Ivšić (1913 2, 45) gives the adjectives mútan, prázan, távan ‘dark’ (old a.p. b) in a.p. C, together with old a.p. c adjectives like gládan, etc. However, he also notes the forms: krúpan / krūpȁn, prázan, rûžân – rûžno, vrídán / vrídȁn, žêdan / žêdàn (b) as well as secondary víran / vîràn (a), žéîan / žêîn (< *A < c). According to Ivšić’s scanty data, at least some Posavian dialects preserve the opposition of a.p. B: and C: at least partially. According to Ivšić, the type A:B: is not present in Posavina because this type has merged with a.p. C:, but he provides no actual data to support the claim. Such a merger looks rather strange considering that the Neo-Štokavian type dîvan would be *dîvān – *dîvna – *dîvno in Posavina, which is a fact that Ivšić has apparently failed to notice. It would be hard to imagine that the mentioned type could mix with the type *glâdān – *glâdnā – *glâdno (except perhaps through the generalized def. forms *dîvnī / *glãdnī). Besides, later data from Posavina clearly show that the type with the constant ~ exists there as well. Cf. my data from Orubica: dîvan – dîvna – dîvno, trîzan – trîzna – trîzno, smîsan, and also bîdan – bîdnā (!) – bîdno – pl. bîdni (cf. glâdan – glâdnā – glâdno in a.p. C). Such a pattern with the constant ~ exists in -ak adjectives as well (see below).
In the Posavina dialect of Slobodnica (my data), the adjectives of the old a.p. $b$ have turned into various different groups:

a) a.p. $B$:; cf. *krúpǎn – krúpna – krúpno* (thus also *mútǎn, práźǎn, vřídǎn, támnǎn and mírǎn*);

b) a.p. $A^B$:; cf. *dǐčǎn – dǐčna – dǐčno* (thus also *gřdǎn, mǎzǎn, prǎśǎn*);


e) a.p. $C^-B$:; cf. *dȗžǎn – dúžna – dúžno* (thus also *sǰǎjǎn*);

f) a.p. $A$:; cf. *dɨvǎn – dɨvna – dɨvno* (thus also *krȃsan, kvȃran, mȳsan*).

In the adj. *rávǎn / rǎvan / rávan – rávna / rȃvna – rȃvno* there is a complete mixture, and in the adj. *gřěsǎn* the root is shortened.

For Kostrč, Baotić (1979, 198–199) gives a pattern with the constant neo-acute on the stem as in adjectives like *dǐčǎn, gřdǎn, krúpǎn, mlićǎn, trǔdǎn* (all adjectives with $A^B$: or $B$: in Neo-Štokavian) and *žědǎn*. In these adjectives, the end stress can appear in some cases like *trǔdnȃje* 242 ‘she is pregnant’ but not very frequently. This pattern is in agreement with the Neo-Štokavian type *krȃsan – krȃsna – krȃsno* and, together with previously mentioned data from my field recordings in Posavina, shows that Ivšić made a mistake in his description of -an adjectives in Posavina. However, one finds in Kostrč, like in Slobodnica above, also the pattern with the constant ́ that includes *dɨvǎn, bȳǔjǎn* ‘lush’, *gŋěvǎn, kǐvǎn, slȁvǎn, stȃlǎn* ‘constant’. This type is not easy to explain, especially considering the fact that the first four adjectives should have constant ́. Their accent could be explained by analogy to *slȁvǎn and stȃlǎn*, where the constant ́ is due to the generalization from the -RC- forms in the old a.p. $a$, but it is not clear how and why the constant neo-acute would be replaced by the constant circumflex in these adjectives. Still, it is noteworthy that in the adjectives with the constant neo-acute (like *dǐčǎn*) there are no resonant-ending stem ones, while in all adjectives with the constant neo-circumflex all stems end in a resonant (mostly -v-). This may indeed point to an analogy to the *slȁvǎn* type. Regrettably, Baotić gave no other examples (there are probably

---

242 Baotić, probably by mistake, has *trudnȃje* with no pretonic length.
more of them). In any case, it seems safe to assume that the dîvān type is secondary in Kostrč. Two adjectives, krȃsān and prȋsān (a.p. A^B: type elsewhere) shift to a.p. C in Kostrč.

Except for the C: type (as in mȃstān – mȃsna – mȃsno) there is also the Kostrč a.p. B:/C: type, which continues the older a.p. B: type, cf. the pattern mȋrān / mȋrȃn – mȋrno / mȋrno (thus with variant B: and C: forms). This group mostly consists of old a.p. b adjectives, cf. mȋrān / mȋrȃn (PSl. c, Štok. also B:), ^kvȃrān / kvȃrȃn, ^stȋdān / stȋdȃn, ^tȃmān / tȃmȃn (the short vowel a.p. b originally) and ^dȗžān / dȗžȃn. These are joined by ^žȇľān / žȇľȃn (with the generalized length and the development of B:/C: < *A < *c), which shifts to a.p. B: elsewhere in Posavina as well.

The Kostrč system, it seems, points to an older system with a.p. C:, a.p. A^B: (the constant neo-acute) and a.p. B: (with end stress). This system was altered in that some a.p. A^B: adjectives acquired constant circumflex, while some old a.p. B: adjectives developed variant a.p. C: forms. In addition, a couple of adjectives shifted to other accentual paradigms.

ČAKAVIAN (t°ȃman – Vrgada, ^bȋdan – Pitve)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>short vowel</th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m f n</td>
<td>m f n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t°ȃman</td>
<td>t°āmnȃ t°ȃmnō</td>
<td>t°āmnī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>long vowel</th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m f n</td>
<td>m f n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bȋdan</td>
<td>bȋdna bȋdno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Čakavian, the original scheme *dȋčān – *dȋčna – *dȋčno develops in different ways. Some northern dialects (like Grobnik, Rijeka and Orlec), preserve a.p. b quite well, while in many other dialects this type completely shifts to a.p. C: (thus in Senj, Vrgada and in most adjectives in Orbanići). This shows the hegemony of a.p. C in Čakavian in *-ьнъ adjectives as in other types of adjectives. The dialects that preserve a.p. b do it in different

---

244 My data.
ways. On Brač, some of them remain in a.p. A\textsuperscript{B}; while some shift to a.p. C:. Perhaps the maintenance of the a.p. A\textsuperscript{B}: type has something to do with the proximity of the South Dalmatian insular Čakavian to Western Štokavian. A.p. B: is, as already said, well preserved in Grobnik, although a portion of the adjectives goes over to a.p. C:. In Orlec, most of the adjectives are in a.p. B:. On Susak and in Trtni, both a.p. A\textsuperscript{B}: and a.p. B: exist. This is an exception since Čakavian dialects in general, unlike Štokavian, usually do not have both type A\textsuperscript{B}: and type B: as a reflex of the old a.p. b (the same is in Kajkavian).

Hraste (1935, 33) mentions only a.p. C for Hvar (g\nùsan – g\nùsnà – g\nùsno), but ČDL gives the forms b\ndan, -na, -no, tr\ndan – tr\dnà (cf. the secondary tr\dnà in Dračevica on Brač), gr\šan but m\šnà (with a shift to C) for Brusje. The adjective d\ivan looks like an old a.p. \textit{a} adjective with the generalized length (see below for Brač). The adjective g\ándan – g\nà – garnà ‘nasty’ looks suspect – it is not clear if this is some peculiar innovation or a remnant of the old a.p. B: type (as in Štokavian) that is lost elsewhere on Hvar. Cf. my data from the dial. of Pitve: b\don – b\dno – pl. b\d – b\dnà, sm\šan – sm\šna – sm\šno, tr\zan – tr\znà – tr\zn (the original a.p. b) and secondary gl\dan – gl\dno – gl\dnà – pl. gl\d – gl\dnà, j\dan – j\dna – j\dno angry (the PSl. a.p. c). In Vrboska (Matković 2004), cf. b\don – b\dno, ž\edan, but tr\zan – tr\znà – tr\zn, vr\dan – vr\dnà – vr\dno with a shift to a.p. C (the adjectives gl\dan, -dna, -dno, j\dan are also secondarily in a.p. A\textsuperscript{B}:).

On Brač (Šimunović 2009), the adjectives corresponding to type A\textsuperscript{B}: and B: adjectives in Štokavian belong to two large groups – types A\textsuperscript{B}: and C:. Starting with the original *d\čàn – *d\čna – *d\čno pattern, some adjectives generalized the accent of the f. and n. forms in the m. forms as well, which has yielded the pattern d\čan, -na, -no, i.e. the new a.p. A\textsuperscript{B}:. The other group merged with reflexes of the old a.p. c like gl\dàn – gl\dnà – gl\dnà. The merger with a.p. C: might have occurred in more than one way. However, most probable is a middle phase of a.p. B:, i.e. the expected *vr\dàn – *vr\dno firstly yielding *vr\dàn – *vr\dnà – *vr\dno and then creating the new forms *vr\dan and *vr\dno by analogy to a.p. C: (*d\žan, *d\žno) on the basis of the accentually identical f. forms *vr\dnà (B:) and *d\žnà (C:). Thus, for a portion of the original a.p. b adjectives one gets the pattern vr\dan, vr\dnà, vr\dno (C:). Simply put, all adjectives with
a neo-acute in the m. form belong to a.p. A\textsuperscript{B}: These forms usually exhibit constant neo-acute stress in all forms (like \textit{pro\'zan}, \textit{-zna}, \textit{-zno}), but in some cases different forms are possible (including end stressed forms \textit{tr\'udn\'a}) – sometimes only in Dra\v{c}evica, sometimes generally,\textsuperscript{245} most often only as variants, but as the only option in \textit{sm\'i\'san}. The adjective \textit{tu\'zan} – \textit{t\'u\'zn\'a} – \textit{t\'u\'zno} has a special transitionary sub-type (\textit{m\'iran} can also have such an accentuation next to the usual a.p. C:).

A.p. A\textsuperscript{B}: (type \textit{pr\'ozan}, \textit{-zna}, \textit{-zno}) consists of the old a.p. \textit{b} adjectives: \textit{b\'idan} (Pu\v{c}i\v{s}\'ca:\textsuperscript{246} b\'idan / b\'idan), \textit{di\'can}, gr\'\i\'san (Pu\v{c}i\v{s}\'ca: gr\'\i\'san), m\'lo\'can, r\'u\'zan, \textit{pr\'ozan}, sm\'i\'san (sm\'i\'sn\'a – sm\'i\'so), s\'\i\'dan, tr\'\u{d}an (Dra\v{c}evica: tr\'\u{d}n\'a), t\'u\'zan – t\'u\'zn\'a – t\'u\'zno, \'ze\d\'an – \'ze\d\'no – \'ze\d\'no. These are joined by gl\'\o\l\'dan, \textit{-dna}, \textit{-dno} (Dra\v{c}evica: gl\'\o\l\'n\'a – gl\'\o\l\'no), originally a.p. \textit{c}.

A.p. C: (type \textit{t\'isan} – \textit{t\'isn\'a} – \textit{t\'isno}) consists of: g\'\i\'dan (unreliable due to the shortened \textit{r}), m\'\i\'san (the same), m\'\u{t}an, pr\'\i\'san raw, r\'\o\v{r}an flat, tr\'\i\'zan, vr\'\i\'dan (all a.p. \textit{b} originally), as well as m\'\i\'ran (m\'\i\'ran – m\'\i\'rn\'a – m\'\i\'no in the dictionary).

A.p. A: (with the circumflex in all forms), which looks like the original a.p. \textit{a} with a generalized circumflex from the \textit{-RC-} forms (b\'\u{u}jan, \textit{-jna}, \textit{-jno}) consists of b\'\u{u}jan, d\'\i\v{v}an and gr\'\o\zan. It is possible that this a.p. A: is a product of the levelling of the older a.p. C:.

On Vrgada (Juri\v{s}i\v{c} 1966, 82; 1973), all of the old a.p. \textit{b} adjectives shifted to a.p. C: (type d\'\u{u}\'zan – d\'u\'zn\'a – d\'u\'zno)\textsuperscript{247} – m\'l\'\o\'\i\'\i\'can, m\'\u{t}an, pr\'\o\'\i\'\i\'zan, pr\'\i\'san, r\'\o\'\i\'van, s\'m\'o\'\i\'\i\'man (cf. Si\v{c}e: m\'\i\'mi ‘lures’ for a.p. \textit{b}), sm\'i\'san, t\'\o\'\i\'\i\'man, tr\'\i\'zan, t\'u\'zan (t\'u\'zn\'a and t\'u\'zna), tr\'\u{d}an, vr\'\i\'dan. In this a.p. C:, some of the forms can have sporadic neo-acute root stress, cf. d\'u\'zna, gl\'\o\l\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\'\i\’
On Susak (Hamm, Hraste, Guberina 1956, 114), both type A\textsuperscript{B}: and type B: exist, which is otherwise very rare in Čakavian. Thus, in a.p. A\textsuperscript{B}: we find the original a.p. b adjectives mútan and důžan, as well as secondary zlátan (originally a.p. c), while a.p. B: is preserved in adjectives like râván – râvně – trúdân – trúdně – trúdnô and žajän ‘thirsty’.

In Senj (Moguš 1966, 77), as on Vrgada, there is only a.p. C: – grîšan, krúpan, mútan, prázan, tůžan, vrîdan.


In Rijeka (Strohal 1894, 159), the old a.p. b is preserved as a.p. B: in the adjectives grēsȃn sinful, mútân, prâsân, râvân, trêzân, tûžan, zêjän thirsty.\textsuperscript{249} The following adjectives of the old a.p. b also have a.p. C: (> A:, with ˇ in all indef. forms) variants: dûzan / dûznȁ, prâzan / prâznô, trûdan / trûdân, vrîdan / vrîdân. The adj. mlâcan lukewarm shifted to the other paradigm completely. Cf. also mrâcan and prâsan / prâsân.

In Gacka (Kranjčević 2003), just three adjectives, důžan, snâžan and vrîdan remain in a.p. B: (there is no a.p. B: / a.p. A\textsuperscript{B}: distinction in the dialect due to retraction of the final accent) and the rest shift to a.p. A: < *C:; e.g. krûpan – krûpna – krûpno (the same in bâjan, bjêdan, hûjan, grîdan, kîvan, mlîčan, mútan, sjâjan, stûdan, sûšan, trûdan, trîzan, tûžan, rûžan, žêdan), cf. also the village name Krâsno (nà Krasno clearly shows a transfer to a.p. C:). The short vowel from the old long vowel a.p. b is found in smîšan, which is very unusual. In addition, in grîšan – grîšna – grîšno one finds a sort of a middle phase of this peculiar shortening in the old long vowel a.p. b.

\textsuperscript{249} Some examples have -án, some -án.


**Kajkavian (Velika Rakovica)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short vowel</th>
<th>Indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>Definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temen</td>
<td>+temnā</td>
<td>+tēmno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long vowel</th>
<th>Indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>Definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tūžen</td>
<td>+tūžnā</td>
<td>+tūžnō</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reflex of the old a.p. b in Kajkavian is either a synchronic a.p. B: (end stress or its reflex) or a.p. A:B: (constant neo-acute in all indef. forms). The first option is present in V. Rakovica, Bednja and Prigorje and the other one in Varaždin and Turopolje, although in the latter two this could be just a phonetic reflex of the older a.p. B: (cf. rōka < *rōkā ‘hand’ and järēm < *jārēm ‘yoke’ in Turopolje). In most of the dialects, the reflexes of the old a.p. b and c are merged (thus in all dialects below except Varaždin and, of course, Križanić) – in the synchronic a.p. B: nonetheless, which is contrary to the tendency towards the hegemony of a.p. C in suffixless adjectives. As already mentioned, in Kajkavian, as well as in Štok/Čak., there is a tendency for all of the adjectives with short and shortened root (their a.p. origin aside) to shift to a.p. A (see above), while only long stem adjectives remain in a.p.

---

B/C (in the case of *-ьпъ adjectives they merge in a.p. B:). Thus, there is a polarization according to the root vowel quantity.


Jedvaj (1956, 305) gives only a few examples for Bednja. A.p. B: is found in the adjectives kvâérên ‘rotten’, trêȳdên ‘difficult, pregnant’ and žâjên ‘thirsty’ (PSl. b), while mûrên ‘caring’ (cf. Siče: mûri cares) show an unclear shortening.

Valjavec (1894, 227–228) in his description of Kajkavian gives the following adjectives with ´, where both old a.p. b and c adjectives are found (in opposition to all of the adjectives with “), regardless of their origin:

a) the original a.p. b: béden, blûden, bújen, dîčen, diven, dúžen, jâlen, kvâren, krâsên, mlâčen, múten, prâzen, présen, ráven, rûžen, sjâjen, sméšen, snâžen, trêzen, tûžen žêden;

b) the original a.p. c: bûsen, glâden, hlâden, másten, míren, prâšen, strâšen.\(^{251}\)

The origin of the forms with “ that Valjavec gives as variants in some cases is unclear (most are a.p. b by origin).\(^{252}\) dîčen, grâšen, grôzen, jáven, mlâćen, mlêđen, rûjen, skrûben, slâven, têmen, trûden, tûžen (Valjavec says that dîčen, grâšen, etc. is more frequent). Such an accent would be expected in front of consonantal groups, which could be generalized in cases like slâven (a.p. a) and iêmen (the short vowel a.p. b originally), but it is unclear how this type could spread to such a large number of cases.

In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002), most of the original a.p. b adjectives yield a.p. A^B:, cf. dîčen (but dîćna), grâšen, jâlên, kvârên, mlâćen, múten, prâzen, râven, smêšen, trêzen, trûden, vrêđen, žêjên. These are joined by most of

\(^{251}\) The reconstruction of the original a.p. is not certain in some of these cases, and the Kajkavian a.p. needs not necessarily correspond to the Štokavian one. But the general picture is still the same in this case.

\(^{252}\) Valjavec 1894, 226.
old a.p. c adjectives like būdēn, glādēn, zlātēn (next to the old short vowel a.p. c adj. drōbēn), etc., as well as by lāčēn (the original a.p. a) stālēn as well. On the other hand, the adj. snāžēn, tôžēn, ūmēn (a.p. b originally) shift to a.p. C: The adj. màžēn is short (cf. also Varaždin màza ‘pet’ but Štok. màza ~ màzan / màzan – màzna / màzna).

In Turopolje (Šojat 1981, 400), both the old a.p. b (dōžēn, smēšēn, trēžēn, vrāvēn straight, flat, žējēn) and the old a.p. c (bēsēn, glādēn, màštēn) yield a.p. A^B:

In Prigorje (Rožić 1893–1894 2, 156–157), a.p. B: encompasses the old a.p. b and c adjectives (the pattern: mǐsān – mǐsna – mǐsni (n.)):

a) the original a.p. b: dīčan, dūžan, grēšan, mrāčen, mǐsān, mūtān, prēsān, rāvān, snāžan, sūšan, trēžan, trūdān, tūžān, žēdān;

b) the original a.p. c: glāsān, jādān, lādān, màsān, màrān “mirān”, zlātān.

In Ozalj (Težak 1981, 273), the situation is the same as in Rožić’s description of Prigorje – the old a.p. b and c merge in Ozalj a.p. B: (the pattern mǐrān – mǐrāna – mǐrāno – def. mǐrānā):

a) the original a.p. b: grīšān, mnāčān lukewarm, mūtān, prāzān, rāmān flat, straight, sūsān, sālān, trūdān, tūžān, žēdān;

b) the original a.p. c: bīsān, būdān, glādān.


In Slovene, the old a.p. b is preserved in the pattern rāvān – rāvnā – rāvno (with a secondary pattern rāvōn – ravnō – ravnō), cf. also tōmēn – tōmnā – tōmnō, but there is also a great deal of vacillation and paradigmatic shifts (cf. a.p. C variant ravnō as well).253


---


254 It is clear that the split of the old long vowel a.p. b adjectives into a.p. B: and a.p. A^B: should be regarded as provisional. This exact division, with a great deal of vacillation, functions mostly in Štokavian only. The split is not present synchronically in all dialects, nor should it be necessarily reconstructed for older stages. The two types can be regarded as one synchronic type for some dialects.

255 The adjectival a.p. b (very well attested by different Štok/Čak. dialects, in spite of the Old Russian a.p. C, see above) is connected to a.p. d of the basic noun.
(and mlȃčan A:\ but mlȃk C:/B:), mȗtan' blurred (cf. Siče mȗt̄im), prȃzan' empty (and prȃ'zan A:\, PSl. b), prȃ'san' raw (and pr̄'san A:\), rȃvan' flat (and rã'van A:\, PSl. b), rȃzan' various (usually def. rȃ'zn̄i), rȗzan ugly (cf. Siče: rȗžim), směšan' funny (and smẽšan A:\, PSl. b, cf. smijẽh – smijéha laughter, Siče: smjẽši smiles), snāžan' strong (cf. snága strength B:/B:-C:/C:, Siče: osnãžim I make stronger), trȗdan' pregnant, tired (and trȗ'dan, PSl. b, cf. trȗ – trȗda effort, Siče: trȗdī tries), tȗžan' sad (and tȗ'žan A:\, PSl. b, cf. tȗga – tȗgu sadness), vȁžan' important (a Czech / Russian loanword), vrȇdan' worthy (cf. vrijédn̄ošt ‘worth’ and Siče: vrȗdī it is worth), žȇdan' thirsty (and žȇ'dan A:\; > C:)257

a.p. A:\:258 : bȃ'jan fantastic, blȗ'dan wanton (cf. Siče: blȗdim), bȗ'jan lush (but cf. bȗjati flourish), dȋčan glorious (cf. dika – diku pride, Siče: dȋcimo we take pride), dȋ'van wonderful (cf. Siče dîvi se admires), gnjȇvan' furious (and gnjȇvan' but cf. gnjȇv – gnjȇva fury), grȗdan nasty (cf. Siče: grȗdim I scold), grȗ'shan sinful (> grȗ'šan A, cf. grijȇh – grijέha ‘sin’ but Siče: gɾȋšhm I sin), grȇ'zan terrible (cf. grȇza – grȇzu dread), jȃ'lan envious (but cf. jȃl – jȃla envy), jȃ'van public (cf. jáva – jávu wake), kȗ'van bitter, kljȗ'čan key (> A, cf. kljȗč – kljȗča key), krȗ'san lovely (cf. Siče: ukrȃsīm I decorate), kvȗ'ran corrupted (cf. kvȗ'r – kvȗra breakage), mȃ'zan cuddly, mlȇčan milky (cf. mlijéko milk), mrȃčan' dark (also C:?, cf. mrȃk – mrȃka dark but PSl. *morkь d/b), mȑ'san meaty, fat (> C:, cf. Siče: mȑśim), sjȃ'jan bright (and B:, Kajk. also A < *c?, but cf. sjȃj – sjȃja brightness), stȗ'dan shy (but cf. stȗd – stȗda shame, PSl. b/d, Siče: stȗdī is ashamed), stvȗ'răn real (cf. Čak.-Kajk. stvȗr thing), sȗ'šan dry (cf. dial. sȗša), tȃ'jan secret (but cf. tȃjīm I keep a secret, Siče: tajīm), Ż'man wise (but cf. Żm – Żm̄a259 mind), vȗ'stan great (cf. vȑsta – vȑstu type, sort, > A), žȗ'dan' anxious

Note: In Neo-Štokavian, a.p. A:\ is synchronically, of course, identical to a.p. A:, which appears by length levelling from the forms with pre-

256 Thus, not a *-ьнъ adjective originally.
257 We reconstruct a.p. b on the basis of the frequent a.p. b reflexes in Kajk., Čak. (which is very significant considering the hegemony of a.p. C there), and Posavina.
259 But Russian ўм – ум̄а.
resonant lengthening. Thus, dȉćan – dȉčna – dȉčno (cf. dika – diku) is in Neo-Štokavian the same as sȉlan – sȉlna – sȉlno (cf. sȉla and older sȉlan). However, the distinction, putting the historical one aside, is still maintained in Old Štokavian: dȉćan but sȉlan.

3. a.p. c

Proto-Slavic

short vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*češṭṇь *češṭná *češṭno</td>
<td>*čěsṭṇý *čěsṭṇá *čěsṭno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

honorable’

long vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gòlḍṇь *gòlḍná *gòlḍno</td>
<td>*gòlḍṇý *gòlḍṇá *gòlḍno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘hungry’

Cf. a.p. C in Old Russian дóлженъ – должнà – дóлжнo (Дыбо 1981, 72). The a.p. C pattern has been preserved to a point in the modern language as well but with a great deal of vacillation and paradigmatic shifts.

Štokavian

short vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>částan</td>
<td>čásna</td>
<td>čásno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

long vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gládan</td>
<td>gládna</td>
<td>gládno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( gládan) | ( gládno)

A.p. C: is preserved in Western Štokavian (e.g. in Dalmatinska Zagora, Lika, Posavina), while it disappears, shifting to a.p. B:, in Eastern Štokavian,
including the classical literary Štokavian Vuk-Daničić norm with younger gládan – gládna – gládno instead of the older gládan – gládna – gládno (C:) by analogy to túžan – túžna – túžno (B:). In the present a.p. C, only the long vowel stem adjectives remain (as well as the short vowel adj. bôlan ‘painful’ – at least in some dialects, cf. this to bôs in the suffixless adjectives), while all of the old short vowel a.p. c adjectives shifted to a.p. A (see above). In all of Štok/Čak/Kajk., only Križanič’s dialect differs from this. In this way, a polarization of adjectives based on quantity appears. In opposition to the Proto-Slavic system with three a.p. in all adjectives, a new system appears where the short vowel adjectives (with the exception of gol and bos among the suffixless adjectives and bolan among *-ьнъ adjectives) are in a.p. A (or a secondary a.p. stemming from it), while long vowel adjectives preserve the opposition between a.p. B and C. This opposition is secondarily disposed of in many dialects – by merging into a.p. B in the East and, in a more limited way, by the domination of a.p. C in the West.

Unlike in suffixless adjectives (like drȃg – drága – drȃgo), there was no simple reflex for the long vowel stem adjectives with the suffix *-ьнъ – the unforgiving phonetic laws stood in their way. According to the ‘One mora law’ (cf. Kapović 2011b and see above), the Proto-Slavic long circumflex is preserved in shorter words but shortened in longer ones (measured in morae). According to the law, one would expect shortening in some forms of *-ьнъ adjectives and the preservation of the long circumflex in other forms. Thus, one expects the shortening in e.g. *gôlsъno > glásno (like in *môžsъko > müško ‘male’ or *dȅlcǫ > djȅcu acc. sg. ‘children’) but not in *gôlsъnъ > glâsan (cf. * sûlkъtъ > lȃkat ‘elbow’ and *bôbъnъ > bȗbanj ‘drum’). We give here the Proto-Slavic long vowel a.p. c paradigm and its expected outcome in Štokavian:²⁶⁰

Proto-Slavic
m. – n. – f.
N. *gôlsъnъ – *gôlsъno – *golsná
G. *gôlsъna – *golsъnъ
d. *gôlsъnu – (*gôlsъně)

²⁶⁰ For Štokavian, only the reflexes of the old indef. forms are given, while the later borrowed def. forms are disregarded – the same forms in PSl. are written in brackets.
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A. *гольсънъ – *гольсъно – *гольсъно
L. *гольсънѣ – (*гольсънѣ)
I. (*гольсъномъ) – *гольсъноjo

n. *гольсъни – *гольсъна – *гольсъны
(g. *гольсънъ)
(d. *гольсъномъ – *гольсънъымъ)
a. *гольсъны – *гольсъна – *гольсъны
(l. *гольсънѣхъ – *гольсънѣхъ)
(i. *гольсънъй – *гольсънъй)

m. – n. – f.
N. *глѣсън – *глѣсъно – *глѣсъны
G. *глѣсъна – *глѣсънѣ
D. *глѣсъну
A. *глѣсънъ / *глѣсъна – *глѣсъно – *глѣсъну
L. *глѣсънѣ (*глѣсъну)\(^{261}\)
I. *глѣсъном

n. *глѣсъні – *глѣсъна – *глѣсъне
a. *глѣсъне – *глѣсъна – *глѣсъне

It is understandable that such a system can hardly have been stable. The alternation of long and short syllables in the paradigm was settled by generalizing either length or shortness. Thus, one gets *глѣсънъ \(^{262}\) – *глѣсъна – *глѣсъно if the length was generalized and *глѣсънъ – *глѣсъна – *глѣсъно if the shortness was generalized. The latter belongs to a.p. A – this is the case in all modern dialects – with a middle phase of the short a.p. C, attested in Križanić’s dialect: Глѣсънъ – *гласъна – *глѣсъно if the length was generalized and *глѣсънъ – *глѣсъна – *глѣсъно if the shortness was generalized. The latter belongs to a.p. A – this is the case in all modern dialects – with a middle phase of the short a.p. C, attested in Križanić’s dialect: Глѣсънъ – *гласъна – nom. pl. m. *глѣсънъ – *глѣсъних. Sometimes both long and short forms (глѣсънъ / гласънъ) coexist in the same dialect, and sometimes we find one form in one and the other form in another dialect, while in some cases the same form is generalized everywhere (e.g.

\(^{261}\) For the initial, and not final, accent in loc. sg. see above.
\(^{262}\) The length in the final syllable disappears as in words like лѣкат, бѣбань.
glândan is long everywhere and rédan is short everywhere, at least according to our data).\textsuperscript{263} The shortening of the old long vowel a.p. \textit{c} can be seen in the following Štokavian adjectives:

a) only shortened stem – rédan, sprâsna, ždrëbna;

b) both the shortened and the long stem – bítan / bítan, glâsan / glásan, gnûsan / gnûsan awful, krëpan / krijëpan, prâšan / prášan dusty, slâstan / slâstan delicious, snëžan / snijëžan snowy, strâšan / strâšan scary, svjêstan / svijêstan aware, vjêčan / vijêčan, žûčan / źûčan.

In the rest of the cases, the length has been generalized. The outcome of intraparadigmatic levelling is likely to have been influenced by other, extraparadigmatic, forms as well (i.e. the forms that were not part of the indef. adjectival a.p. \textit{c} declension). Thus, the generalization of length in glâsan may have been influenced by the noun glâs, while the generalization of the short syllable may have been stimulated by the original def. form *glasnî. In any case, there was a tendency to get rid of the complex quantitative alternations (this was also the reason that the secondary def. form *glâsnî instead of *glasnî was created later).

As already said, the old short vowel a.p. \textit{c} adjectives shifted to a.p. A (see above). The only exception is the adj. bolan in some dialects. This may be because it has -\textit{ln}-, hence vocalization of \textit{l} and lengthening: bôlan – bó(l) na – bô(l)no (by analogy also bôlan, which can yield the pattern bôlan – bôlna – bôlno). The original accents are well preserved in the forms bôlan and bóna that have turned into vernacular forms of address, i.e. emphatic words in a number of Bosnian-Herzegovinian (and Dalmatinska Zagora) dialects, e.g. dôdi bôlan! ‘come!’ (to males) and dôdi bóna! ‘come!’ (to females).

For the old and new accent in def. forms (e.g. hlâdnî / hládnî) see above.

\textsuperscript{263} It is quite possible that there are some dialectal variants of various adjectives that are not noted in this article due to the author’s unawareness of their existence or due to the fact that these dialects / forms have not yet been described in a satisfactory manner. More research in the future will provide new data, which will make our view of the accentual development of adjectives more precise.

In Imotska krajina, the old a.p. c yields the transitional a.p. C:/B: (see above).\textsuperscript{264} Rešetar (1900, 115) gives the adjectives gladan, prašan, žedan for a.p. C in Dubrovnik (many old a.p. b adjectives shift to C, see above). The hegemony of a.p. C is typical for Rešetar’s ‘southwestern Štokavian dialects’ (see above for Prčanj and Ozrinići).

In Prapatnice (Vrgorska krajina), the old a.p. c adjectives either:

a) stay in a.p. C: gládan – gládna – gládno – def. gládnī, the same for bīsan (def. bīsnī / bīsni), glásan (def. glásnī), másan (def. másnī / māsnī), zlátan (def. zlātnī / zlātnī);

b) shift to a.p. B: būdan\textsuperscript{265} – būdna – būdno – def. būdnī, srāman (def. srāmnī / srāmnī);

or c) get stuck in between (B:-C:): ládan / ládan (gen. sg. ládna) – ládna – lādno / ládno – def. lādnī (cf. a similar situation in this adjective in Imotska krajina);


\textsuperscript{264} Except for the already mentioned examples, cf. also ládan but ládna – ládno (Šimundić 1971, 132).

\textsuperscript{265} Cf. also būdan (B:) in Slobodnica in Posavina (my data).
ČAKAVIAN (bōlan – Orbanići, glādān – Novi Vinodolski)

short vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th></th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bōlan</td>
<td>ḅuölna</td>
<td>ḅuölno</td>
<td>glādān</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

long vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th></th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glādān</td>
<td>glādnā</td>
<td>glādno</td>
<td>glādnī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As usual, a.p. C is well preserved in Čakavian. In some dialects (e.g. Vrgada, Senj), it remains the only a.p. In others, mixture with a.p. B and shifts to other accentual paradigms occur. As for the a.p. C pattern itself, the results are numerous – preservation of the original pattern (e.g. in Grobnik or Senj), generalization of ` in all forms (e.g. in Gacka and partly in Orbanići) or other changes (like the Vrgada retraction of the type glōâdnâ ⇒ glōâdna).


On Brač (Šimunović 2009), as already seen, a.p. A:B; and a.p. C: exist. The latter consists of just two old a.p. c adjectives (gnûsan, svîstân) and by many old a.p. b ones (see above). The adj. bûdan, glôdan shifted to a.p. A:B;, while some other old a.p. c adj. developed mixed paradigms:

b) a.p. A:B;-C:2 hlôdan – hlôdnâ – hlôdno and mîran / mîran – mîrnâ – mîrno (the same in tûžan, which is a.p. b originally).

---

266 Kalsbeek 1998, 420.
267 Langston 2006, 178, 182.
268 The f/n. neo-acute is due to pre-resonant lengthening in a.p. A.
Shortening of the old a.p. $c$ is seen in $krippan$.

On Vrgada and Senj, a.p. C, which is the only remaining a.p. there, consists of the old a.p. $c$ and $b$ (see above). On Vrgada, shortening is seen in the $krippan$ – $kripna$ – $kripno$ (probably from the older a.p. A). The variant $kripno$ in n. is interesting.

In Rijeka (Strohal 1894, 159), a.p. $c$ is preserved in adjectives like glâdan, mîran, zlåtan (cf. also mrâcan and prâsan / prâsân with this pattern), where the pattern has the generalized ^ in all forms. The old short vowel a.p. $c$ adjectives (dròban, bòlan) are in a.p. A, as well as the shortened strâsan ‘scary’.

In Gacka (Kranjčević 2003), most of the old a.p. $c$ adjectives stay in a.p. A: (\(\text{*C}\)) with the generalized circumflex: bîsan – bîsna – bîsno (thus also bûdan, glâdan, lâdan, suîžan, vîdan, zlåtan). The shortening is seen in gnjûsan, krîpan and the adverb glâsno.

In Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007), the short vowel a.p. C is perhaps preserved in bûlān – bûlnâ – bûlno. The one in pötnâ – pîtno may also theoretically be archaic but the secondary a.p. C from the older a.p. A as in blâtān – blatnâ – blâtno (see above) is more probable. Of course, the same kind of development is possible for bûlån as well. The reflexes of the long vowel a.p. $c$ are for instance glâsån – glâsna – glâsno, the same for gnûsån, jâ-dân, màsån, skrbån. In a couple of adjectives, ^ is generalized in all forms: strâšån – strâšna – strâšno, as variants also in zlåtån, zrâčån (thus in the dictionary part but zlåtnå, zrâčnå in the grammatical introduction).


Data from Orlec (Houtzagers 1985) is scarse. Only two secondary examples are attested stûdno and trêzen (originally a.p. $b$), while mûren and žajên have a.p. $b$ reflexes.


\[269\] The variant skrbån is the result of a tendency to shorten syllabic r (cf. kvê / kîv ‘blood’ in Grobnik).

\[270\] Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 106.
Kajkavian (Velika Rakovica)\(^{271}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>short vowel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>m</em> <em>f</em> <em>n</em></td>
<td><em>rōsen</em></td>
<td><em>rōsni</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+rosnā</td>
<td>+rōsna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+rōsno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long vowel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>m</em> <em>f</em> <em>n</em></td>
<td><em>glādēn</em></td>
<td><em>glādni</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+glādnā</td>
<td>+glādna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+glādnō</td>
<td>+glādno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In most of Kajkavian dialects, the old a.p. *c* merges with the old a.p. *b* – most often in a.p. B:. The distinction is maintained in Varaždin with a somewhat changed roster of members of a.p. B:\(^{272}\) and C.

According to the sources with which we operate here, the shortening of the old long vowel a.p. *c* is seen in the following Kajk. adjectives:

a) shortened stem only – *gńȕsẹn*, *rēdẹn*, *slāstẹn*, *srāmẹn*, *vȅčẹn*, *zrȁčẹn*, *žȍčẹn*;

b) both shortened and long stem – *glȁsẹn* / *glāsẹn*, *mȁstẹn* / *māstẹn*, *mȉrẹn* (Bednja) / *mȉrẹn*, *sjȁjẹn* / *sjājẹn* (?), *skȑbẹn* / *skr̄bẹn* (?), *strȁšẹn* / *strāšẹn*, *zlȁtẹn* (Križanić only) / *zlātẹn*.

In other adjectives, the length is generalized. Shortened stem adjectives are more numerous in Kajkavian than in štokavian, while štokavian, on the other hand, has more of them than čakavian. For shortened adjectives, see above under a.p. A as well, and for the dialects with a.p. *b = c* reflexes cf. above under a.p. B.

It is important to note that \(˘\), which stems from the original \(*˘\) by the ‘One mora law’, does not lengthen in front of -CC- (unlike the old acute). That is the reason why Kajk. has the pattern *glāsen* – *glāsna* – *glāsno* in the old long vowel a.p. *c* and not **glāsna** – **glāsno**. This pattern has also influenced

\(^{272}\) Of course, the question of naming synchronic a.p. is always somewhat arbitrary. For instance, the Varaždin opposition of *trūdȩn* and *dȣȣžȩn* can be treated as a.p. A\(^B\): vs. C: as well as a.p. B: vs. C: (more so considering that a dialect with a stress retraction cannot have a real end-stressed a.p. B:). If a dialect cannot distinguish (due to retractions) between a.p. A\(^B\): and B:, we generally name it B:.
the old a.p. a adjectives (see above). Cf. also the Varaždin (Liplj in 2002)
form mūško ‘male’ < *mǭžysko for this kind of development.

In V. Rakovica (March 1981, 264), there is only a.p. B: in the long
vowel adjectives, where all old non-shortened a.p. c adjectives are (mīrȇn,
glādȇn, prāšȇn). The stem vowel is shortened in glāsen, māstȇn, strāšen,
skȇrben. In Valjavec’s Kajkavian, Rožić’s Prigorje, Ozalj and Turopolje, the
old a.p. c and b adjectives merge in a.p. B (see above).

However, in Varaždin (Liplj in 2002) a.p. B: and C stay separate. Some
of the old a.p. b adjectives shifted to a.p. C and some of the old a.p. a adjectives
have secondary ̑ (see above), while the adjectives dȇžẽn and vîdẽn are the
only old a.p. c adjectives that remain in a.p. C (additionally, the def. form
strȃšnȇ and the adverb strȃšnọ may be from *strȃšn; similarly also def.
sjȃjńi and adverb sjȃjnọ). The adjectives bûdẽn, glādẽn, měrẽn peaceful,
mrȃcẽn, zlȃtẽn (as well as the originally short vowel a.p. c adj. drȇbẽn)
shifted to a.p. B:. As already seen, the root is shortened in most adjectives:
glȃsẽn (comp. glaslȩśi), gńȇsẽn (but a secondary comp. gńȇsńęśi), mȃstȩn
(comp. masńęśi), rȇdẽn, srȃmȩn, zrȃcẽn (but comp. zrȃčńęśi), def. żȇcni.
Their adherence to a.p. c is confirmed, in some cases, by the accent on the
comparative form ending (gńȇsńęśi and zrȃcńęśi have secondary accent but
other adjectival groups, i.e. adjectives with other suffixes, also show the
connection of the comparative accent and the original mobile paradigm).

century dialect is an exception because, as opposed to contemporary dialects,
it preserves the short and shortened a.p. C, i.e. the shortness / shortening of
the root is not equal to a.p. A. Cf. czésten – Czestná – czéstno / czéstnọ –
gen. pl. czestńich (and acc. pl. czéstnich) – def. czestńi ‘honorable’ for the
old short vowel a.p. c, as well as Γlȃcẽn – glasńa – nom. pl. m. glásni – gen.
pl. glasńich and strászen – strasznà – strászno – nom. pl. m. strásznì –
c. The adjective 3lȃmẽn – 3lȃmńa (with a shortening not seen in modern
dialects) is an exception. The final accentuationin def. a.p. c forms is also
well preserved in adjectives with a short root, cf. rodnọgo, rodnĩm, zemnája,
etc.

In Slovene, the old a.p. c is preserved in the pattern hladȇn – hládnọ –
hladnọ, cf. also dolžan and bolan, drobńan, močan, etc. As can be clearly
seen, unlike Štok/Čak/Kajk., both the old short and long vowel a.p. c adjectives remain in a.p. C. The short vowel a.p. c > A shift was not possible in Slovene since there the old circumflex intonation regularly shifts to the next syllable.

**a.p. C:** 'bēșan angry, enraged (cf. bijēs – bijēsa rage), 'bolan painful (> C: > A<; cf. bōl – bōli pain), 'bolestan sick (> A, cf. bōljeti hurt), 'būdan awake (cf. Siče: budī awakes), 'bunovan delirious (> 'bunōvan, cf. būnilo delirium), 'glādan hungry, 'glāsan loud (and gl'asan A < Križanić C, PSl. c, cf. glās – glāsa voice), 'gnūsan hideous (and gn'usan A), 'gojāzan > A shift was not possible in Slovene since there the old circumflex intonation regularly shifts to the next syllable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'bēșan</td>
<td>angry, enraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'bolan</td>
<td>painful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'bolestan</td>
<td>sick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'būdan</td>
<td>awake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'bunovan</td>
<td>delirious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'glādan</td>
<td>hungry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'glāsan</td>
<td>loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'gnūsan</td>
<td>hideous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'gojāzan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
but strășiti frighten), 'vīdan apparent (and A<sup>B</sup>: cf. vīd – vīda sight), 'zlătan golden (>A<sup>B</sup>: cf. zlăto gold), 'zrăčan airy (cf. zrâk – zrâka air)<sup>281</sup> 'zvūčan sonorous (literary word), 'žūčan bitter (and A, cf. žūć – žūći gall)

### *-ъкъ adjectives*<sup>282</sup>

#### 1. a.p. a

**Proto-Slavic**

**Indefinite adjectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mь署rzъkъ</td>
<td>*mь署rzъka</td>
<td>*mь署rzъko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘odious’

**Definite adjectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*mь署rzъкъйъ</td>
<td>*мь署rzъкаъяя</td>
<td>*мь署rzъкоъе</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Štokavian**

**Indefinite adjectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mȑzak</td>
<td>mȑska</td>
<td>mȑsko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(mȑskо)

**Definite adjectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mȑskī</td>
<td>mȑskā</td>
<td>mȑskō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(mȑskо)

In Štokavian, the -ak adjective a.p. A behaves like any other a.p. A. It can shift secondarily to a.p. B’ or C. The a.p. B’ variant (mȑzak – mȑska – mȑskо)<sup>283</sup> exists in the standard language as well, unlike in -an adjectives where this is not the case. In this regard, -ak adjectives do not behave in the same way as -an adjectives since dialects exist where glădak – glătka – glătko ‘smooth’ has an innovative a.p. B’ (like dȕg – dùga – dùgo ‘long’), but a.p. A gădan – gădna – gădno ‘nasty’ is preserved. Similar to that, there are dialects (e.g. many Posavian ones) where a.p. A is more or less preserved in the suffixless adjectives (like slȁb), while having shifted to the younger a.p. C in -ak and -an adjectives. Thus, there is not necessarily a parallelism of paradigmatic shifts between different adjective groups.

---


<sup>282</sup> For the material and reconstruction of *-ъкъ adjectives, cf. Дыбо 1981, 94–107 and Дыбо 2000, 160–175. The suffix *-kъ was added to the old u-adjectives in PSl. after the loss of this adjectival declension, e.g. *blizъкъ ‘close’ from the older *blизъ, cf. Croat. blǐz ‘close’ and the adverb blǐzu ‘close’.

<sup>283</sup> This a.p. B’ can shift to a full a.p. B type mȑzak – mȑska – mȑskо.
The origin of the Štokavian a.p. A, as in Čakavian and Kajkavian, is highly diverse – it includes adjectives from all PSl. accentual paradigms. This is not strange if one considers the fact that short vowel stem adjectives are by far the most numerous in the dialects. Thus, a.p. A consists of:

a) the original a.p. a adjectives – glądak, gȉbak mobile, mȑzak, rȅzak acrid, tȕpак sour, źȉdak viscous, źȕhak bitter;

b) the original short vowel a.p. b adjectives – krȍtak meek;

c) the shortened old long vowel a.p. b adjectives – blȉzak close, krȁtak short (dialect. krȁtak), ljȕbak lovely, nȉzak short, low, ūzak narrow (dialect. ūzak);

d) the original long vowel a.p. c adjectives – brȉdak cutting, dȑzak audacious, krȅpak brisk, kȑhak fragile, pȉtak drinkable, slȁdak sweet, vȉtak slim.

Except for the mentioned examples, there are a few other adjectives for which the reconstruction of the PSl. original a.p. is not certain. As for a.p. a, the situation is clear. The old short vowel a.p. b and c adjectives join a.p. A in the same way that *-ьпъ adjectives do. The forms *krȍtъka – *krȍtъko (a.p. b) regularly yield krȍtka – krȍtko and krȍtak (for PSl. *krotъkъ) is analogical to them. Thus, one gets a.p. A.

The shortening of the long vowel a.p. c is similar to the situation in *-ьпъ adjectives. In adjectives like *sȕlȕdkъ, gen. sg. *sȕlȕdъka – f. *soldъkь – n. *soldъko, one would expect *slȁdāk, gen. sg. m. *slȁtkъ – f. *slȁtkā – n. *slȁtko, with quantitative alternations. As in *-ьпъ adjectives, levellings occur. The generalization of short vowels yields a.p. A, slȁdak – slȁtka – slȁtko (where the place of the stress in f. slȁtka is analogical to slȁtko and slȁdak). What is different is that in -an adjectives the short version was generalized in just a few cases (like slȁstan), many adjectives (like glȁdan) generalized the long version, while a certain number of cases exhibits both long and short variants (glȁsan and glȁsan). The peculiarity of -ak adjectives lies in the fact that most often shortened variants are generalized (except for tȇžak, which is completely shortened only in some Čakavian dialects and partially in a few Štokavian ones, see below). That is why there are but a few cases of quantitative variations in -ak adjectives in the dialects (vȉtak / vītak, Šimundić 1971, 128, and pȉtak / pȉtak, as well as a somewhat special case mȅk(ak) / mȅk).
For the shortening in a.p. b, see below.

In def. forms, ” on the root is expected, e.g. glȁtkī. A secondary accent like glȁtkī can also appear. Since a number of old a.p. c adjectives shifted to a.p. A, one could expect forms like slȁtkī to be archaisms rather than innovations. Theoretically, the adjectives that have shifted to a.p. A by generalizing the ” variants may have preserved the old a.p. c def. accent. Of course, that is impossible to prove today. It is not rare that in a dialect some of a.p. A adjectives (or a.p. B adjectives stemming from the older a.p. A) have one accent, while other adjectives have a different one (e.g. dîskī ‘rude’ but plîtki ‘shallow’, etc.).

In Imotska krajina (Šimundić 1971, 126–128, 130), tȑpak ‘sour’ and krȍtak are in a.p. A/C, i.e. the older a.p. A is preserved as a variant next to the newer a.p. C, while all other adjectives (gibak, gladak, žitak; kratak; krȍtak; tanak; sladak, vȉtak) shift to a.p. C completely (tanak, as one can see, did not remain in a.p. C but shifted to a.p. A and then again to a.p. C).284


284 A different development, *tȁnak – *tȁnka – *tȁnko → + tȁnak – + tȁnka – + tȁnko (by short vowel generalization), is also possible.

285 The form slȁtka is from the older *slatkȁ via kanovačko lengthening and should be regarded the same as slȁtka elsewhere in the Slavonian dialect group.

286 The form slȁdȁk is probably a misprint.
Greda only glâdak is still in a.p. A. One should note that such a situation is different from that with suffixless adjectives, where most adjectives in Kobaš and Sikerevci preserve the old a.p. A. In Brodski Stupnik, the old a.p. A is preserved in suffixless adjectives, but all -ak adjectives shift to a.p. B (blźak – bliska – blisko – def. bliskū).

ČAKAVIAN (Vrgada)\textsuperscript{287}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glâdak</td>
<td>glatkā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What we said for the Štokavian a.p. A holds more or less for Čakavian as well. A.p. A is preserved in some Čakavian dialects, while it shifts to a.p. C, or less frequently to a.p. B, in others.


We have seen that on Hvar a.p. A is preserved in suffixless and -an adjectives. However, the situation with -ak adjectives is different, although data is scarce. The preservation of a.p. A in Brusje can probably be seen in nom. pl. f. bliske (ČDL gives blźak (!) – blīska – blisko as basic forms), but the shift to a.p. C is seen in mârzak – marskā – mārskō and slâdak – slarkā – slōrko. A.p. C is also attested in plīlkā ‘shallow’.\textsuperscript{288}

On Vrgada (Jurišić 1973), all adjectives belong to a.p. C (glâdak, nȉzak, ūzak). In Filipjakov and Preko,\textsuperscript{289} a.p. A is preserved in all adjectives, cf. Filipjakov glâdak, nȉzak, blźak, ūzak, slâdak, tānak (here in a.p. A as well) and Preko glâdak – glātkā – glātko (and slâdak – slātkā – slātko with lengthening by analogy to the m. form where it is expected), nȉzak, blźak, ūzak, tānak – tȏnka – tȏnko (with regular lengthenings) but also tȅžak – tȅška – tȅško (cf. below for težak).

\textsuperscript{287} Jurišić 1973.

\textsuperscript{288} Hraste (1935) does not mention -ak adjectives at all, but cf. also Vrboska (Matković 2004) slatkū and the form slalkō from Pitve (my data), which point to the shortened *slâdak i.e. *slâdak.

\textsuperscript{289} Data by Nikola Vuletić.


The old a.p. a adjectives are joined by the old a.p. b (krȁtak, nȉzak, Żzak, see below) and a.p. c adjectives (tȁnα and shortened kȕpαk, pȉtak, slȁdak).

In Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998, 151), a.p. A is preserved, cf. glȁdak – glȃtkα – glȁtko (the same in nȉzak, krȍtak, lȃgak light, mȅkak soft, tȁnα, slȁdak, tȅžak heavy).

### Kajkavian (Velika Rakovica)291

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m f n</td>
<td>m f n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glȁdek</td>
<td>+glȁtkα +glȁtko</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Kajkavian, some dialects preserve a.p. A, while in others it shifts to a.p. C or B. In the Kajkavian a.p. A, i.e. among the adjectives with “”, there can be more examples than in Štokavian (for instance, *rȅdẹk and *tȅžẹk, that are AB:, B: or C: in Štokavian, can be in a.p. A in Kajkavian).

In Velika Rakovica (March 1981, 265), all -ek adjectives (glȁdek, mȅhek, nȉzek, slȁdek, zȗhek) are in a.p. C, which is a substitute there for an older a.p. A.

The Bednja (Jedvaj 1956, 305) adjectives with “” in the indef. m. form (this is the only indef. form remaining in the dialect) can be divided into a.p.

---

A (those having ` in def. forms) and into a.p. B: (those with the neo-acute in def. forms). In the first group, there is only nžek – nêiski (which is, by the way, originally a.p. b), while the rest of the adjectives are in the second one: glôdek – glôtki (the same for krêpek, krôtek, lâihek, mâihek, rêdek, slôdek, tênek, žûhek). All of the PSl. a.p. are here and the syllable is shortened even in rêdek. Valjavec (1894, 227) under his a.p. A, i.e. adjectives with ` , also gives words of various origins: glâdek, mȑzek, sklȉzek, žȕhek (a), lȅgek, nȉzek, ŏzek (b), brȉdek, krȍtek, tȅnek, krȅpek, kȑhek, mȅhek, slȁdek (c).

In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002), a.p. A is also very heterogeneous historically, but the distinction between the old a.p. a and c remains in the comparative form. Cf. in the old a.p. a: mȑzek (comp. mȑskȩši), sklȉzek (comp. sklȉskȩši), def. gȉpki, glâdȩk (glâtkȩši), rȅzȩk, def. tȑpkı, žûhek. From the old a.p. b there are lȅhȩk and blȉzȩk (comp. blȉskȩši). In the case of the old a.p. c, most adjectives have the stress on the ending in the comparative form: krȍtkȩ (but secondary comp. kròtkȩši), mêhek (comp. mêhkȩši, younger mêhkȩši), brȉdȩk (comp. britkȩši), def. krEPROMki, kȑhek (comp. krhȩkȩši), pȉtȩk, plȉtȩk (comp. plıtȩkȩši), slȁdȩk (def. slȁtki and slȁtki corny), tȅzȩk (comp. tȅzȩši).

In Turopolje (Šojat 1982, 400), there is the A > B shift, cf. lȅgȩk – lěka < *lęká, nȉzȩk – nȉska < *niská, mȅlek – mȅka, slȁdȩk – slȁtka / slȁtka.

In Prigorje (Rožić 1893–1894 2, 145, 151, 153), adjectives like nȉzak – nȉska / nȉska – nȉska (the same for glâdak, slȃdak, tȅnak) have younger a.p. B variants, while the original a.p. A is preserved in krឍak – krDMA ‘fragile’.

In Ozalj (Težak 1981, 271, 273), all adjectives shifted to a.p. C, cf. tȅžak – tȅška < *tȅšká – tȅska, the same in glâdak, mȅfak, nȉzak, slȃdak. The A > C shift is not new in this area, it appears already in Križanić’s dialect, cf. his glâdak – glatká.

**a.p. A:** bl’izak close (PSl. b, cf. blízu near, blížiti se come near), br’dak cutting (PSl. c, cf. brid – brida edge), d’rak audacious (PSl. c), d’ug’acak long (> C, and dug’acak A and dugačak’ B, cf. dug), g’ibak mobile (PSl. a), gl’adak smooth (PSl. a, cf. glâditi caress), gr’omak stentorian (a Russian loanword), ’ȅdak acrid (and A:/B; rare in spoken language), kr’epak brisk (PSl. c, cf. krijépiti freshen), k’rhak fragile (PSl. c), kr’otak meek (PSl. b, cf.

---

292 Cited from Дыбо 1981, 98. Križanić was born near Ozalj.
293 Cf. Slv. dȑž – dȑza (C:).
Historical development of adjective accentuation in Croatian...

kròtiti tame), lj’ubak lovely (PSl. b, cf. Siče: lübîm\textsuperscript{294} I kiss), m’rzak odious (cf. mržjeti hate, PSl. a), n’izak short, low (PSl. b), p’itak potable (PSl. c?, cf. pîti drink – pila she drank), pl’itak shallow (and A\textsuperscript{B}/B:\textsuperscript{C}:/),\textsuperscript{295} p’rhak crisp (cf. pŕhnuti), r’ězak acrid (cf. rězati cut), skl’izak slippery (cf. sklizati se slide, skate), sl’adak sweet (PSl. c, cf. slâd malt, sláditi se eat something sweet), t’rpak sour (PSl. a), v’itak slim (PSl. c?, cf. vîti flutter – vîla ‘she fluttered’ but also vît slim), ž’idak viscous (> B:, PSl. a), ž’uhak bitter (PSl. a)

2. a.p. b

Proto-Slavic

short vowel

indefinite adjectives definite adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*lъgъkъ</td>
<td>*lъgъka</td>
<td>*lъgъko</td>
<td>*lъgъkъjъ</td>
<td>*lъgъkaja</td>
<td>*lъgъkoje</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘light’

long vowel

indefinite adjectives definite adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ǭzъkъ</td>
<td>*ǭzъka</td>
<td>*ǭzъko</td>
<td>*ǭzъkъjъ</td>
<td>*ǭzъkaja</td>
<td>*ǭzъkoje</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘narrow’

As in *-ьnъ adjectives, the a.p. b stress was, prior to the operation of Dybo’s law, always on the stem (like in a.p. a but without the acute intonation). After Dybo’s law, we find the stress on the first poststem syllable: *ǭzъkъ – *ǭzъka – *ǭzъko. However, the yers weaken and lose their ability to be stressed in weak position – Ivšić’s retraction occurs and we get the forms *ǭzъka – *ǭzъko (the alternative being that there was no progressive shift of stress in these cases to begin with), while the stress of *ǭzъkъ, on a strong yer, remained where it was. Thus a new surface mobility arises, as in *-ьnъ adjectives, which yields opportunities for various kinds of levelling in the dialects, the form *ǭzъkъ or *ǭzъka being taken for pivotal – cf. dial.

\textsuperscript{294} Cf. Дыбо 2000, 219 for a.p. b.

\textsuperscript{295} Cf. Czech / Slovak plytký (which can be either from a.p. a or c). In PSl. this was probably a.p. a (cf. the basic verb *plyti) but in Croat. dialects it behaves as a reflex of a.p. b.
Croat. ūzak and ūzak. However, this levelling was not so important. A larger role was played by a shortening process, which took place in the old long vowel a.p. b adjectives in a number of dialects (Štok/Kajk/Čak.) that yields such forms as ūzak. Such a shortening cannot be phonetically regular, i.e. it is not a case of real shortening. This is probably to be explained by an analogical spread of the a.p. A pattern, since it was by far the most numerous (encompassing the old a.p. a, practically all of the old long vowel a.p. c and almost all of the short vowel a.p. b and c adjectives), while the old long vowel a.p. b adjectives were a rather small group.

Št o k a v i a n

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>short vowel</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>indefinite adjectives</td>
<td>definite adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>läk</td>
<td>läka (lāka)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| long vowel | indefinite adjectives | definite adjectives |
|-------------|-----------------------|
| m | f | n | m | f | n |
| ūzak | ūska (ūska) | ūsko (ūsko) | ūskī (ūskī) | ūskā (ūskā) | ūskō (ūskō) |

There are four possibilities for the development of the old long vowel a.p. b adjectives in Štokavian:

a) a.p. A\textsuperscript{B}: reflex (e.g. krātak – krātka – krātko), i.e. generalization of the accent from the forms *kořťćka – *kořťćko;

b) the a.p. B: reflex (e.g. krátak – krátka – krátko), i.e. generalization of the accent from the original form *kortkň:\textsuperscript{296}

c) the short root, i.e. a shift to a.p. A (e.g. krātak – krātka – krātko);\textsuperscript{297}

d) a secondary shift to a.p. C: (e.g. krātak – krātka – krātko).

It seems that the -ak adjectives a.p. A\textsuperscript{B}: is not preserved in Neo-Štokavian dialects, unlike the type dīvan (< dīvan) in -an adjectives that is

\textsuperscript{296} Of course, krātak (B:) can also be derived from the older a.p. C:, for instance, which can then be an innovation derived from the older a.p. A\textsuperscript{B}; etc. These developments may be different in dialects and in some cases it may be difficult to establish the real historical scenario.


The adjectives that were originally the PSl. long vowel a.p. $b$ can be divided into four groups depending on their reflexes in Štokavian:

a) **krȁtak** – short (the secondary a.p. A or a later development of it) or long (the original $A^B$: B: or secondary C:) – the same goes for **plȉtak** as well;

b) **rijedak** – always long in Štok. ($A^B$:, B: or secondary C:) except exceptionally in Posavina;

c) **blȉzak, nȉzak** – the -z- ending stem adjectives that are always short (a.p. A or something that develops of it);

d) **uzak** – the adjective with a stem in -z-, which is always short (A), except in the Slavonian dialectal group (where it can be $A^B$: or B:).

As already said, the short vowel in adjectives like **krȁtak, blȉzak, nȉzak, ūzak** is certainly secondary (cf. Czech krȁtký, blízký, nízký, úzký), and, for some adjectives, the older long vowel forms are attested in dialects (krȁtak, ūzak). These short forms are not easy to explain phonetically, although three of those adjectives have a stem in -z- (cf. also dȑzak, mȑzak, sklȉzak that are also synchronically a.p. A). Interdialectal variation of this type occurs in pȁtak / plȉtak as well. The easiest explanation, as already said, is that this is an analogy to a.p. A, which is the a.p. encompassing most of the -ak adjectives, even though such an analogy seems somewhat odd. One should also say that some dialects show transitional forms like ūzak – ūska in Batina (Baranja). For more examples, see below.

As for the original short vowel stems, the adj. **krȍtak** (originally a.p. $b$), as already said, shifts to a.p. A and for **lȁk** see below.

In Imotska krajina (Šimundić 1971, 127), the adj. **+krȁtak** has a short vowel and there is unfortunately no mention of other a.p. $b$ -ak adjectives.
In Prapatnice, nǐzak and ûzak are short, while krâtak – krâtka – krâtko – def. krâtkî (the same in rîdak) have shifted to a.p. C. In Dubrovnik (Rešetar 1900, 117), krâtak is in a.p. C (also plîtak), cf. Prćanj krâtak (A) and Ozrinići krâtak (A) but also krâtâk – krâtka – krâtko (B:). In Molise (Piccoli, Sammartino 2000), cf. nǐzak but krâtak – krâtka, -o in B:299

Sekeřeš gives only a.p. B: (krâtak, plîtak, rîdak as well as téžak) for Baranja (1977, 389). However, my field data from one of those dialects (Batina) is not in accord with this (see below). Ivšić (1913 2, 45–50) mentions only a.p. B: (krâtak) and a.p. C: (rîdak), which is not representative for the Slavonian dialect group. Baotić (1979, 198–199) attests a.p. A^B: (krâtak – krâtka – krâtko) in all adjectives (cf. also plîtak, rîdak, ûzak) for Kostrč.

In my Slavonian dialect field data, most of the local dialects have a.p. A^B: (like Kostrč) – that is the case in Sikerevci, Orubica, Babina Greda, Velika Kopanica, Slobodnica, Šljivoševci and Batina. Slobodnica, Orubica, Babina Greda, Velika Kopanica and Šljivoševci have neo-acute (krâtak, rîdak, ûzak, plîtak) in all indef. forms,300 just like Kostrč.

The dialect of Sikerevci and Batina have some peculiar features. In Sikerevci, beside forms with constant neo-acute (krâtak, plîtak, rîdak, ûzak) there are also variant forms plîtak, rîdak, ûzak. In Batina, we find krâtak and rîdak and all other forms with neo-acute but plîtak – plîtka – plîtko and ûzak – ūska – ūsko with short vowel forms only in the masculine. The situation in Sikerevci and Batina shows a transitional stage, between the old a.p. A^B: and the new a.p. A, probably going in the direction of the situation present in most of Neo-Štokavian dialects.

In Kobaš and Brodski Stupnik, we find a.p. B: in these adjectives, cf. Kobaš rîdak – rîtka – rîtko (the same in krâtak, plîtak, ûzak) and Brodski Stupnik krâtak, plîtak, rîtko (plus téžak and góarak secondarily). This is in accord with Ivšić’s krâtak (but not his rîdak, which is not attested at all in my data).

The Slavonian data available up until now clearly shows, although this cannot be seen by the scant and unrepresentative data provided by Ivšić,
that, unlike Neo-Štokavian, most of the dialects have preserved the original a.p. \( A^B \): in the place of the old a.p. \( b \), while a few Posavian dialects have a.p. \( B \): instead of it.

ČAKAVIAN (lāgak – Grobnik,\(^{301}\) krātak – Orbanići)\(^{302}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short vowel</th>
<th>Indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>Definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>ļāgak</td>
<td>ļāhkā ļāhko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td>ļāhkī -ā -ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long vowel</th>
<th>Indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>Definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>ļrātak</td>
<td>ļrātkā ļrātko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Čakavian, it seems that the stem is always short in the adjectives blīzak, nīzak (but cf. vućāk in Donjostulanski dial., DGO), while krātak and rēdak show both the shortness and the preservation of a.p. \( A^B \): or \( B \):, depending on the dialect. The preservation of a.p. \( A^B \): is found both in the South (Hvar / Brač) and in the North (Orbanići), while a.p. \( B \): is attested in the North (Rijeka, Grobnik). Of course, as in other adjectives, the old a.p. \( b \) can shift to a.p. \( C \) here as well, in accordance with a general propensity for a.p. \( C \) in Čakavian.

From Pitve on Hvar, I have the form krōtak – krōlka – krōlko with the preservation of a.p. \( A^B \): (cf. also krōtak in Brusje, ČDL) attested but rīlkā – rīlko ‘rare’ with a shift to a.p. \( C \). In Vrboska on Hvar (Matković 2004), cf. krōtak – krōtkā – krōtko with a shift to a.p. \( C \) and the same in plītak – plītka – plītko but with a probably later generalization of ^.

On Brač (Šimunović 2009), blīzag, nīzak and ĭsak are short, while a.p. \( A^B \): is preserved in krōtak – krōlka – krōlko and rīdak – rīlka – rīlko shifted to a.p. \( C \) (the same in plītak).

On Vrgada (Jurišić 1973), nīzak and ĭsak are short, while krōtak – krōtkā – krōtko (and plītak, rītak) have shifted to a.p. \( C \). In Filipjakov, krātak – krātkā – krātko (the same in plītak, rīdak), as in Preko\(^{303}\) (the only difference being in the vocalism of krōtak in Preko), can be both a

---

\(^{301}\) Lukežić, Zubčić 2007.

\(^{302}\) Kallesbeek 1998.

\(^{303}\) Recorded by Nikola Vuletić.

On Rab (Kušar 1894, 34), $krātak$ is short and the same occurs, which is not very usual, in $rēdak$ as well (def. $rētki$ but also $rētki$ in the city of Rab). The short form is seen in the def. $plītki$ / $plitkī$ as well (there is no indef. form). On Susak (Hamm, Hraste, Guberina 1956, 112–114), we find a.p. $A^B$: in $r^{ē}tk – r^{ē}tka – r^{ē}tko$ ($ūsk$ is short), while $plūtāk$ ($plītf$) – $plūtva – plūtvo$ seems to preserved the original PSl. a.p. $b$ accentual pattern, but it is not possible to make conclusions on isolated forms.

In Senj according to Moguš (1966, 77; 2002), $krātak$ and $rēdak$ belong to a.p. C (as well as $plūtak$ – the adj. $blīzak$, $nīzak$, $ūzak$ are short). In Rijeka (Strohal 1894, 159), $nīzak$ is short, the old short vowel $lāhak$ is in a.p. B’ ($l^{ā}hākā$ – $l^{ā}hākō$), while $krātāk$ and $rēdāk$ are in a.p. B:. Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007) shows the short vowel in $ūzak$, the shift to a.p. C in $lāgak – lāhak – lāhko$ and a.p. B: in $krātāk$ – $krātākā$ – $krātkō$, as well as in $rēdāk$ and $plūtāk$. In Gacka (Kranjčević 2003), $rēdāk$ – $rētka$ – $rētko$ shifted to a.p. A: ($< *C:$) and $krātak$, $nīzak$, $ūzak$ (+ $plūtak$) are short (but cf. the def. $krātki$ / $krātkɔ$, where the expected length can still be seen).

From Orlec (Houtzagers 1985), not much data is attested since these adjectives have def. forms only, but def. $nīski$, $ūski$ does point to the short vowel and def. $krātka$ and $plūtki$ to a.p. $A^B$: or B: in the historic indef. forms. In Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998, 151), the short vowel is present in $nīzak$, $krātak$ – $krātka$ – $krātko$ (and $plūtak$) are in a.p. $A^B$: . Cf. also a.p. A in the old short vowel a.p. $b$ adj. $krōtak$ – pl. $krōtki$, $lāgak$ – f. $lāhka$.

| Kajkavian (lāihek ‘light’ – Bednja\(^{305}\) nīzek – Velika Rakovica)\(^{306}\) |
|---|---|---|
| short vowel | indefinite adjectives | definite adjectives |
| | m | f | n | m | f | n |
| lāihek | | | | lāihki |

---

\(^{304}\) Preko has no neo-acute whatsoever and Filipjakov only in traces.

\(^{305}\) Jedvaj 1956, 305.

\(^{306}\) March 1981, 265.
There are basically two options in the reflexes of the old long vowel a.p. \( b \) adjectives in Kajkavian. One is shortening of the stem, sometimes even in cases like *rědъkъ, which does not appear in Štokavian, and the other one is the preservation of the original reflexes of a.p. \( b \), either in the shape of a.p. \( A^B \) or \( B^: \) (although the distinction of these two types is not possible in most Kajkavian dialects that have retracted the accent). Križanić’s data from the 17th century is especially interesting since they provide insights related to the dating of some processes (see below).

In Velika Rakovica (March 1981, 265), only the form \( \text{nȉzek} \), with a short stem, is attested. In Bednja (Jedvaj 1956, 305), the short stem is seen in \( \text{nȉzek} \), \( \text{krȍtek} \) ‘short’, \( \text{rȅdek} \) and \( \text{vȕzek} \), while a trace of the old a.p. \( b \) is probably to be seen in the def. forms \( \text{krȍtki} \), \( \text{rȉetki} \), \( \text{vȕski} \). Valja v c e c (1894, 227) has short \( \text{nȉzek} \), \( \text{ȕzek} \) and long \( \text{krãtẽk} \), \( \text{rẽ} \ddot{d} \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \) (also \( \text{plȉte}\kappa \)). In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002), the short vowel is present in \( \text{blȉzȩk} \) (and \( \text{plȉtȩk} \)), while the direct reflex of the old a.p. \( b \) can be seen in \( \text{krãtẽk} \), \( \text{nȉzȩk} \) (comp. \( \text{nȉžȩsi} \)), \( \text{rẽ} \ddot{d} \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \), def. \( \text{vȍski} \) ‘narrow’. The neo-acute is also secondarily present in the masculine forms of \( \text{žȉtȩk} \) – \( \text{žȉtko} \) (originally a.p. \( a \)) and \( \text{vȉtȩk} \) – \( \text{vȉtko} \) (acc. sg. \( \text{vȉtku} \)) – \( \text{vȉtko} \) (originally probably a.p. \( c \)). The Varaždin form \( \text{nȉzȩk} \) is very archaic and interesting since this adjective has the secondary short stem in almost all Kajk/Čak/Štok. dialects. In Turopolje (Šojat 1981, 400), \( \text{nȉzȩk} \) is short, while the old a.p. \( b \) length is present in \( \text{krãtẽk} \), \( \text{rẽ} \ddot{d} \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \).\(^{307}\)

In Ozalj (Težak 1981, 271, 273), the short vowel is seen in \( \text{nȉzək} \) (also in Rožić’s description), and a.p. \( B^: \) in \( \text{krátək} \) – \( +\text{krátka} \) – \( +\text{krátka} \). Such a system in the place of the old a.p. \( b \) is attested by Križanić\(^{308}\) as well: \( \ddot{b}lūzok \).\(^{309}\)

---

\(^{307}\) In dialects like Turopolje and Varaždin, there can be no distinction between a.p. \( A^B \) and \( B^: \) due to the retraction of the type \( \text{glāvə} < \text{glāvə} \) ‘head’.

\(^{308}\) Cited from Дыбо 1981, 97.

\(^{309}\) Križanić often does not note the stress after the pretonic length. The ending -\( \ddot{ok} \) is, of course, Russian but the accents are from Križanić’s local mother tongue.
Mate Kapović

(but also blízok [blizok]) – бли́зко, крѧткъ – крѧтко, рѫдок – рѫткъ, вѫзєк. In the adjective Nůзoк – nizká 310 one can see the short vowel and the shift to a.p. C (the same in Težak’s and Rožić’s description). This clearly points to the fact that the curious short vowel forms in the old long vowel a.p. b occur at least as early as the 17th century, i.e. that this is not some kind of more recent change (but cf. Varaždin nǐzȩk), even though this is already clear from the geographical spread of this feature. Regrettablly, there is no attestation for *blizъkъ and *ǫzъkъ in Težak’s and Rožić’s description, since these adjectives are still a.p. B: in Križanić’ texts. One should also note that Križanić’s a.p. B: in *blizъkъ is unique among Kajk/Čak/Štok. dialects since it seems that all modern dialects show a short vowel in this adjective.

a.p. B: krā’tak short (> C:, A, PSl. b, cf. krátiti shorten), rě’dak rare (also B: and Posavina/Kajk/Čak. A, > C:, PSl. b), u’zak narrow (and B:, > A, PSl. b, cf. sūziti to narrow)

3. a.p. c

Proto-Slavic

short vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*těлькъ</td>
<td>*тенька</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘thin’

long vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*тёгъкъ311</td>
<td>*тёгъка</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘heavy’

310 Cited from Дыбо 2000, 165.
311 The form *тежъкъ with *-ž- is younger.
ŠTOKAVIAN

short vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tȁnaka</td>
<td>tȁnka / tȁnka</td>
<td>tȁnko / tȁnka</td>
<td>tȁnkō</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

long vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tȇžak (těžak)</td>
<td>téška</td>
<td>tȇško (těško)</td>
<td>tȇško</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.p. C is preserved in a number of Štokavian dialects in two of the old short vowel a.p. c adjectives, gȍrak – górk – górko and tȁnaka – tȁnka – tȃnko, and in one old long vowel a.p. c adjective, tȇžak – téška – tȇško. In Štokavian, after the operation of the ‘One mora law’, the length in all forms has generalized only in tȇžak (and dialectally as a variant in vȋtak / vȉtak and mȅk ‘soft’ with a variant mȅk, see below). In all other old long vowel a.p. c adjectives, the short vowel forms are generalized together with the shift to a.p. A, cf. brȉdak, dȑzak, krȅpak, kȑhak, slȁdak, etc.

In the adj. težak, as in old long vowel a.p. c -an adjectives, one would expect shortening of the old long circumflex in some forms. Thus, one would expect the pattern *tēžāk – *tēškȁ – *tȅško. The forms with the expected shortening (i.e. with “) of the old long circumflex have been generalized in many Kajkavian and Čakavian dialects (see below). In Neo-Štokavian, the length is generalized in all dialects (tēžak or younger těžak), but traces of the old shortened forms are preserved in some Posavian dialects (see below) that have the shortened form tȅžak together with the length in other forms. One would actually not expect “ in this form (nom. sg. m.), but this is certainly due to the influence of all other masculine forms, where “ is expected according to the ‘One mora law’ (gen. sg. *těška, dat. sg. *těšku, nom. pl. *těški, acc. pl. *těške, etc.). One could also think that the original shortening is preserved in the phrase těško těbi ‘beware!’ (cf. the usual adverb těško), but this is very questionable since such a shortening occurs

---

312 In gorak, length is often generalized (thus góreak or górek, with a shift to B). In tanak, shortness is usually generalized (thus tȁnka / tànka, tȃnko / tànko).
in the phrase *blâgo tȅbi* ‘you’re lucky!’ as well (cf. the usual adverb *blâgo* ‘mild’), where the short vowel form cannot be archaic.


**Sekereš** (1977, 389) gives *tȅžak* in a.p. B: for Southern Baranja (the same for *krátak, plîtak, rídak*). However, in my data from Batina in Baranja the more archaic pattern *tȅžak / tȅžak – tȇška – tȇško* – def. *tȇški* is attested. This dialect also usually generalizes ́, i.e. a.p. B:, but the adjective in question is archaic. Cf. also the example *gȍrak – górka – górko* – def. *gòrki* in Batina with the younger neuter form.

**Ivšić** (1907, 140) gives a.p. C: for Šaptinovac *tȅžak – tȇška – tȇško* and for Posavina in general (*Ivšić* 1913 2, 45, 50) the examples *gȍrak – górko, tȁnak – tánka – tȃnko* and *tȅžak – tȇško*. The situation in Kostrč (*Bao tić* 1979, 198–199) is the same.


---

313 Piccoli, Sammartino 2000.
314 The pre-form is *tȅžȁk*, cf. also in Molise *pȅtȁk* – gen. sg. *pȅtka* for such an accentual development (Piccoli, Sammartino 2000, xxvi).
it is attested in some Čakavian and Kajkavian dialects (but generalized in all forms). Adjectives like dȑzak and slȁdak (the original a.p. c) are always shortened in Slavonia (see above).


ČAKAVIAN (Vrgada)318

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>short vowel</th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m f n</td>
<td>tȁnak tankā tȁnkō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tȅžak tēškā tȅško</td>
<td>tankī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>long vowel</th>
<th>indefinite adjectives</th>
<th>definite adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m f n</td>
<td>tȅžak tēškā tȅško</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tȅžak tēškā tȅško</td>
<td>tȅškī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we have seen, after the operation of the ‘One mora law’ the length is generalized only in tȅžak (dialectally also in vîtak and mēk) in Štokavian, as opposed to the generalized short vowel in other adjectives. Some Čakavian dialects have generalized length in tȅžak as well – this type occurs in South Čakavian, which is generally closer to Western Štokavian than other Čakavian dialects are. However, the generalization of the short vowel (or the presence of “ just in nom. sg. m. as in Posavina) is still far more common in Čakavian than in Štokavian (where it is present, it seems, only in the

---

317 I have the forms tȁnak – tânkā – tânkō – def. tânkī attested in Sikerevci but perhaps tânkō is not reliable.

Slavonian dialect group). On the other hand, in the South one can find the length in the adj. \( měk \) as well, which is a reshaped old \(^*\)-ькъ adjective (see below). The short adjectives \( gorak \) and \( tanak \), as in Štokavian, preserve the original a.p. C in many dialects. Selca on the island of Brač (data by Nataša Šprljan) are remarkable in the preservation of the expected length in adjectives \( gōrāk \), \( tȁnāk \) and facultatively in \( tȅžāk \) (cf. also nouns like \( lākāt \), \( nȍhāt \), \( mȍzāk \), by analogy also in \( glādāk \), \( krȁtāk \) (the length in adjectives like \( mȍcān \) is irrelevant because of the pre-resonant lengthening in the dialect).


Vrgada (Jurišić 1973) has the preserved a.p. C in \( gōrak – gōrkā – gōrko \) and \( tȁnak – tānkȁ – tȁnko \), as well as the southernmost example with \( –ā \) in \( tȅžak – tȅškā – tȅško \). As can be seen, Vrgada shows the length in nom. sg. m. only, just like in the mentioned Posavian dialects.

In Filipjakov\(^3\) near Zadar, one finds \( tȁnak – tānkã – tȁnko \) (A), with the generalized accent from the old nom. sg. m. form, and \( tȅžak – tȅška – tȅško \) with a generalized \( –ã \) in all forms. In Preko on the island of Ugljan, \( –ã \) is generalized in \( tȁnak – tānka – tȁnko \), but \( tȅžak – tȅška – tȅško \) has the generalized \( –ã \). This is, according to our data, the southernmost Čakavian dialect that has a complete generalization of \( –ã \) in \( tȅžak \).

The short vowel in \( tȅžak \) (def. \( tȅški \), in the city \( tȇški \)) is attested on Rab as well (Kušar 1894, 34). In Senj (Moguš 2002), the situation is interesting. The short \( tȁnak – tānkã – tȁnko \) preserves the original a.p. C, while \( tȅžak – tȅška \) has a shortened root (but cf. def. \( tȅški \) with length).

In Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007), a.p. C is preserved in \( gōrak – gōrkā – gōrko \) (def. \( gōrkī \)) and the shortened forms are generalized not just in \( kȑpák \) and \( slȁdak \) but also in \( tȅžak – tȅškā – tȅško \) (def. \( tȅškī \)). In Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998), the younger a.p. A is seen in \( tȁnak – tānka – tȁnko \) as well as in \( tȅžak – tȅška – tȅško \) (A) but without a secondary shift to a.p. C

\(^3\)Moreover, even this is a new discovery since Ivšić does not mention such forms.

\(^\)The Filipjakov and Preko forms recorded by Nikola Vuletić.
as in Grobnik. Of course, it is not completely impossible that the Grobnik a.p. C in têžak is actually an archaism and not a case of C < *A, but this is not very likely in the light of adjectives like glâdak – glatkâ – glâtko. In Gacka (Kranjčević 2003), têžak shifted to a.p. B: and krîpak, pîtak, slâdak are short (tànak is also in a.p. A).

KAJKAVIAN \((těnje k – Bednja,^{321} \text{slàdek} – \text{Velika Rakovica})^{322}\)

\[
\begin{array}{c|cc|c|cc|c|cc|c}
\text{short vowel} & \text{indefinite adjectives} & \text{definite adjectives} \\
\text{m} & f & n & \text{m} & f & n \\
těnje k & tiěnki \\
\text{long vowel} & \text{indefinite adjectives} & \text{definite adjectives} \\
\text{m} & f & n & \text{m} & f & n \\
slâdek & +slatkâ & +slâtko & +slâtka & +slâtko
\end{array}
\]

In Štokavian, the only adjective that has generalized the long stem is têžak (in most of the other old long vowel a.p. c adjectives the shortened form was generalized), while the short têžak is limited to some Posavian dialects. In Čakavian, the form têžak and the shortening are more widespread than in Štokavian, and in Kajkavian the generalization of the shortened forms in the old long vowel a.p. c occurs in all adjectives, including těžěk (however, this adjective is not attested in many dialects, i.e. in their dialectal descriptions).

In Velika Rakovica (March 1981, 265), the adj. mȅhek is short and belongs to a.p. C (< *A). The accent of mrskî (originally a.p. a) is probably due to analogy to synchronically / superficially similar, but historically / derivationally completely different, adjectives such as lovskî ‘hunting’, tatskî ‘thief’s’, ludskî ‘other people’s’. In Bednja (Jedvaj 1956, 305), a.p. B\(^{323}\) is seen in těňek – tĩenki, and the short vowel (and a.p. B) in krěpek – krěepki, mȁjhek – mȁjhki and slȍdek – slõtki. Valjavec (1894, 227) notes the short vowel in brȉdek, krȅpek, kȑhek, mȅhek, slâdek and a secondary length by analogy to the -CC- forms in górek. In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002),

---

\(^{321}\) Jedvaj 1956, 305.  
\(^{322}\) March 1981, 265.  
\(^{323}\) Of course, this a.p. B is conditional, standing in opposition to a.p. A (with a neo-circumflex in def. forms).
the shortening occurs in all old vowel a.p. c adjectives (brđek, měhek, těžek, etc.), while the old a.p. c is signaled by the accent in the comparative (see above). For Prigorje and Turopolje see above.

In Ozalj (Težak 1981, 271), a.p. C (probably from the older a.p. A) is seen in těžok – těška < *těškā – těško (the same in měfok ‘soft’, sládok from the old a.p. c adjectives). This situation in Ozalj is supported by Križanić’s324 forms: krúpok – krepkā – krepkō, Mékok – z’mechkoiu, těžkō – těžkō – loc. pl. těžkák, brűdok – brűdok – gen. sg. bridkogā (the mobility has developed in the old a.p. a like glatkā – gládko, etc.). Križanić’s data show us that the shortening of the old long vowel a.p. c occurred already in the 17th century in all adjectives in that area and that these adjectives had already merged with the old a.p. a adjectives in the modern a.p. C. This situation is preserved up until today in Ozalj.

a.p. C: ‘gorak bitter (> C:), ‘tanak thin (> A, PSl. c, cf. stánjiti to thin), ‘těžak heavy, difficult (also A and A-C:; cf. těžiti weigh)

Shortenings and lengthenings in *-ьнъ and *-ъкъ adjectives

Here, we shall give an overview of the old long vowel *-ьнъ and *-ъкъ adjectives in which shortening of stems occurs (in a.p. c and b) and *-ьнъ adjectives of the old a.p. a in which lengthening occurs. What we do not consider here are obvious and clear cases of pre-resonant lengthening (or pre-consonant group lengthening in Kajkavian) and later generalizations of such a length (like in górrka or sílna).

*-ьнъ adjectives325

a) the old long vowel a.p. c – only short vowel attested
   rědān, spräsna, ždrěbna

b) the old long vowel a.p. c – short vowel in some dialects, long in others
   bītan / bītan, glāsan / glāsan, gnjūsan / gnjūsan, křěpan / křěpan,326
   māstān / māstān (A in Kajk.), mīran / mīran (A in Kajk.),327 präšan /

---

324 Дыбо 1981, 98.
325 Different yat reflexes are marked with a ě. The phonological traits of the examples are Štokavian.
326 For křěpan cf. ARj, where this form is given according to Della Bella’s kri-
327 jepan.
327 Usually a.p. B: in Štok. in relation to the innovative a.p. B: in the basic word
mīr – mīra ‘peace’ (instead of the older mīr – mīra).
prȃšan, sjȁjan / sjȁjan (A in Kajk.), skȑban / skȓban (A in Kajk.),
slȁstan / slȁstan, snȅžan / snȅžan, srȁman / srȕman (A in Kajk.),
strȁšan / strȃšan (A in Čak., Kajk. and Posavina), sveštan / svȅstan,
vȅčan / vȅčan,328 zrȁčan / zrȃčan (A in Kajk.), žȕčan / žȗčan
c) the old long vowel a.p. c – only long vowel attested
bȅsan, bȗdan, dȕžan, glȁdan, hȑdan, mȕčan, zlȃtan
d) the old long vowel a.p. b – adjectives with secondary shortening
grȅșan / grȅșan, kljȗčan / kljȗčan, mȗran / mȗran (A in Kajk.),
smȅșan / smȅșan (Gacka), svȉlan, štȅdan / štȅdan
e) a.p. A – adjectives with secondary lengthening
brȉžan / brȉžan, bȕčan / bȗčan, čȃstan / čȃstan, jȁsan / jȃsan, kȕžan /
kȕžan, lȕžan / lȃžan, pȕstan / pȕstan, sȗzan / sȗzan

*-ъkъ ADJECTIVES
a) the old long vowel a.p. c – only short vowel attested
brȉdak, dȑzak, krȅpak, kȑhak, slȃdac
b) the old long vowel a.p. c – short vowel in some dialects, long in others
mȅk(ak) / mȅk, pȉtak / pȗtak, tȅžak / tȇžak, vȉtak / vȗtak
c) the old long vowel a.p. b – only secondary short vowel attested
ljȕbak
d) the old long vowel a.p. b – short vowel in some dialects, long in others
blȉzȁk / blȉzak (B: only in Križanić), krȕtak / krȕtak, nȉzak / nȑzak
(Aȕ: in Kajk.), plȉtak / plȗtak, rȕdȁk / rȕdak (A in Posavina/Kajk/
Čak.), ūzak / ūzak

As already said a couple of times, the ‘One mora law’ operates in the old
long vowel a.p. c *-ьпъ and *-ъкъ adjecival forms, which yields shortened
vowels in some forms (like n. *glȁdno / *vȅčno, *tȅško / *kȑhko, gen. sg.
m/n. *glȁdna / *vȅčna, *tȅška / *kȑhkà, etc.) but length in others (like in

328 Today usually vȉjȅčan in Štوكavian but Vuk and ARj have vȉječan, while
Dаnиčиć 1872, 94 lists this adjective in the same type as dȕvan, i.e. in a.p. Aȕ:. The
length in vȉječan could also be due to analogy to the noun vȉjek (i.e. vȉjȅk) and not from
the old unshortened forms.
cf. also *bŏbъъ > bȕbanj and *mŏžъsko > mȕško. The result of this is that in some adjectives the length (glȃdan, tȅžak) and in others the shortness (vjȅčan, kȑhak) is later generalized. The mechanisms of shortening and later generalizations were basically the same in both the old *-ьnъ and *-ькъ a.p. c adjectives, but the results varied.

In *-ьнъ adjectives, according to our data, brevity is always generalized only in 3 adjectives and length in 7 of them. If Kajkavian is taken out of the picture, there are 15 adjectives that are always long. Thus, we can conclude that in Štokavian and Čakavian the length is usually generalized in *-ьнъ adjectives, while in Kajkavian this need not be the case. In Štokavian, there are 10 adjectives with a quantitative variation in different dialects – this group is more numerous in Kajkavian. The shortening of the old long vowel a.p. b adjectives occurs in 4 cases and the secondary lengthening in a.p. A in 8 of them (mostly in Štokavian).

In the old long vowel a.p. c, the reflexes are impossible to account for if one does not resort to the ‘One mora law’. On the other hand, the apparent shortening in a couple of old long vowel a.p. b adjectives is a different thing altogether. As already said, this is probably to be explained by the influence of the more numerous group of a.p. A adjectives but, whatever the explanation, this does not influence the processes we see in the old long vowel a.p. c that are due to the operation of the ‘One mora law’. The unexpected shortening in the old long vowel a.p. b adjectives is usual in only three cases – grȅšan (cf. also the noun grȅšnīk ‘sinner’ instead of the expected grijȇšnīk), kljȕčan (but this is not an old word, cf. ARj), and svȉlan (this form is, however, not in frequent use today). The other three examples are local (Bednja, Gacka and Imotski).

As for the secondary lengthenings in a.p. A, an explanation is extremely hard to find in a couple of cases (brȋžan, kȗžan, sȗzan). In some of the adjectives (cȃstan, lȃžan, pȏstan), the influence of the basic nouns is obvious (cȃst, lȃž, pȏst), while in bȗčan and jȃsan one can speculate, perhaps not all too convincingly, on the analogy to the rhyming adjectives žȗčan / žȗčan and glȁsan / glȁsan. The secondary long vowel variants could have also

---

329 It must be noted that the basic word brȉga, from which brȋžan / brȋžan is derived, is an Italian loanword.
been influenced by the cases with generalized length from the pre-resonant lengthened forms. Thus, it is possible to imagine that the pattern of slâvan / slâvan or sîlan / sîlan (together with glâsan / glâsan in the old a.p. c) might have influenced the rise of the secondary kûžan / kûžan alternation, etc. However, as in the case of the irregular shortening in the old long vowel a.p. b adjectives, these lengthenings in a.p. A also cannot invalidate the operation of the ‘One mora law’ in the old long vowel a.p. c.

The processes that occur in *-ькъ adjectives are similar but not the same. In the old long vowel a.p. c, the same thing happens as in *-ьпъ adjectives. However, only the short vowel is attested in most adjectives – in 5 of them, while no adjective has generalized the length only (although têžak is always long in Neo-Štokavian). There are 4 adjectives with both short and long variants attested. In *-ькъ adjectives, mixed paradigms, like têžak – têškâ – têško in some Posavian dialects, also occur, but the accentual pattern is not the one that would be regularly expected, i.e. not *têžak – *têškâ – *têško. In the neuter form, the length was taken from the masculine and feminine form and the m. form has the short vowel by analogy to other forms like gen. sg. *têška, dat. sg. *têšku, nom. pl. *têški, acc. pl. *têške, etc., where the shortening is regularly expected.

As for a.p. b, the secondary short vowel forms in the old long vowel a.p. b are far more important in *-ькъ than in *-ьпъ adjectives, where it is just a question of a few side examples. However, in *-ькъ adjectives there is one example that always has a secondary short vowel and 6 of them with both the expected a.p. b reflexes and the secondary short vowels in many dialects (i.e. a.p. A). The long vowel is, however, quite exceptional in blizak and nizak and the short one is non-existent in rëdak in Neo-Štokavian (in Posavina / Čakavian / Kajkavian, it is attested as both short and long).

As in *-ьпъ adjectives, the supposed shortening in the old long vowel a.p. b (which is probably a type of analogy) cannot invalidate the operation of the ‘One mora law’ in the old long vowel a.p. c adjectives. The ‘One mora law’ operates in nouns as well, together with the following generalizations

---

330 Probably by analogy to the operation of the ‘One mora law’ in the old long vowel a.p. c adjectives and to the secondary quantitative variations in the old long vowel a.p. b, the secondary form žîdak is attested instead of žîdak (cf. Dâničić 1872, 93).
of quantity (cf. lȁkat and lȃkat ‘elbow’). Since it operates in nouns, it must have operated in adjectives as well. Without the ‘One mora law’, the accentual development of *-ьkъ and *-ькъ adjectives is hard to explain. In *-ькъ adjectives, where the short vowel is generalized in most of the old long vowel a.p. c adjectives, it is exactly this process that makes the later analogical shift of the old long vowel a.p. b adjectives to a.p. A possible. The merger of the old a.p. a, the most of the old long vowel a.p. c, the old short a.p. b and c (except for gorak and tanak that remain C) in the modern a.p. A brings about a state in which most -ak adjectives have a short vowel (like glȁdak, slȁdak), which then also enables the analogical shift of the old long vowel a.p. b (i.e. a.p. A^B: or B:) adjectives to a.p. A (e.g. krȁtak / krātȁk ⇝ krȁtak). Transitional stages like ũzak – ũska – ũsko are also attested (see above). As already said, the shift to a.p. A can be considered a tendency for all -ak adjectives to generalize the short vowel, i.e. a tendency for the rise of the categorial accent – however, this tendency has not been brought to an end almost anywhere.331 A part of this process might have been rhyming analogies like glȁtka / slȁtka / krȁtka or sklȉska / nȉska / blȉska,332 etc. Even if such an explanation is not accepted, the interdialectal analysis as well as comparison with other Slavic languages points to the clear fact that forms like krȁtak and ũzak are definitely secondary in opposition to the original krȁtak and ũzak.

The adjectives lak, mek, žuk

Three Croat. adjectives ended in *-къкъ in PSl.: *žьıkъкъ (a), *lьgъкъ (b), *мѣкъкъ (c). After the fall of weak yers, the consonantal groups -kk- / -gk- emerged. In Kajkavian and part of Čakavian, these were changed to -hk-, which yielded forms like lagak – lahka and mekak – mehka in the Čakavian North and legek (frequently analogical leheк) – lehka and mehek (frequently analogical meheк) – mehka in Kajkavian. As in other old long vowel a.p. c adjectives in Kajk/Čak., the shortened vowel forms are generalized in *мѣкъкъ as well. In Štokavian and the Čakavian South, -kk- did not yield -hk- but -k-, thus žuka, meka, laka and then, by analogy, also

331 Cf. also Дыбо 2000, 165, where the tendency of of the B type disappearing in Serbian / Croatian is mentioned.
332 This would explain why ũzak is preserved in some (Old) Štokavian dialects, but blȉzak / nȉzak is not.
žuk, mek, lak (the standard language, however, has the form žuhak). Thus, instead of the old *-ъkъ adjectives, the new suffixless forms appeared.\(^{333}\) The adj. žük remains in a.p. A (it can shift to other a.p. later together with other root adjectives, of course).\(^{334}\) The adj. lāk becomes a.p. A, by analogy to *līgъka – *līgъko. The original *mēkъkъ – *mēkъkā – *mēkъko should yield *mēk (gen. sg. *mēka, dat. sg. *mēku, etc.) – *mēkā / *mēka – *mēko. In most dialects, the short vowel has been generalized, i.e. mēk (A), but not in the south-west, cf. Dubrovnik (and Prćanj) mēk\(^{335}\) for Štokavian and Vrboska on Hvar mēk – mēkā – mēko (Matković 2004) and Brač mēk – mēkā – mēko (Šimunović 2009) for Čakavian.

\(^{333}\) New forms with the originally diminutive suffix -ahan also appear: mekahan and lagahan. In most of Štokavian dialects, this leads to mekan and lagan after the loss of h (these forms are actually analogical to mekana / lagana < mekahna / lagahna because they should otherwise be mekaan / lagaan, as is attested in some dialects, cf. ARj). The original a.p. C is preserved in mekan (and by analogy to it appears also in lagan), cf. in Posavina mēkān – mekanā – mēkano.

\(^{334}\) Cf. žōk in Orubica in Posavina (my data), with a special sporadic development of the old *l, typical for western Posavina (in the literature, the form čōn ‘boat’ (cf. Stand. Croat. čūn) is also attested in Orubica – my informants could not confirm this but I have the form čōn ‘small boat’ from Siče attested), Brač žūk (Šimunović 2009) and Filipjakov žūk (Nikola Vuletić, p.c.).

\(^{335}\) Rešetar 1900, 114.
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